

**COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS**  
**281<sup>st</sup> Session of the**  
**Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**April 9-15, 2025**  
 Doubletree by Hilton Hotel San Jose  
 2050 Gateway Place, San Jose, CA 95110

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

**Contents**

Meeting Transcript Summary .....	3
A. Call to Order .....	4
3. Agenda .....	4
B. Open Comment Period.....	5
1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items.....	5
C. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP).....	6
1. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) Report .....	6
2. Research and Data Needs.....	8
3. Socioeconomic Framework Workplan and Update .....	16
4. Adaptive Management Workplan and Update.....	19
5. Council Operations and Priorities .....	36
D. Salmon Management .....	47
<del>1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report</del> CANCELLED .....	47
2. Tentative Adoption of 2025 Management Measures for Analysis .....	48
3. Clarify Council Direction on 2025 Management Measures .....	55
4. Methodology Review Preliminary Topic Selection.....	57
5. Review of Essential Fish Habitat – Scoping.....	67
6. Further Direction on 2025 Management Measures .....	71
7. Further Direction on 2025 Management Measures .....	74
8. Final Action on 2025 Management Measures .....	79
E. Habitat Issues.....	88
1. Current Habitat Issues.....	88
F. Pacific Halibut Management.....	89
1. Incidental Catch Limits for the 2025 Salmon Troll Fishery – Final Action.....	89
G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management.....	92
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report .....	92
2. Exempted Fishing Permits (EFP) for 2025-26 – Final Action .....	93

3. Pacific Sardine Assessment, Harvest Specifications, and Management Measures for 2025-26 – Final Action .....	95
4. Pacific Mackerel Specifications and Management Measures for 2025-27 - Final Action.....	105
5. Science and Management Priorities .....	108
H. Administrative Matters .....	113
1. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures .....	113
2. Fiscal Matters.....	116
3. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.....	117

## 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] All right, with that we'll turn to the agenda that's before you. I'm going to turn to Dani Evenson. Dani.

**Dani Evenson** [00:00:06] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to make a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:10] Please.

**Dani Evenson** [00:00:11] I move that the Council approve the Detailed Agenda as described in Agenda Item A.3 for the April 2025 session of the Pacific Fishery Management Council, which is our 281st session.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:31] All right, thank you Dani. Seconded by David Sones. Thank you David. All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:00:38] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:39] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful.

## **B. Open Comment Period**

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

No transcription for this agenda item.

## C. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

### 1. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) Report

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] And to Council discussion as appropriate. So I'll open the floor up before we go to lunch. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:00:08] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I just want to make sure we capture, there were some things that, some questions that were asked that we're hoping to get some responses on. I'm not sure how best to, you know provide, you know to ensure that those don't slip between the cracks and we don't hear back on that. So we get this report once a year, but I don't know that I'd want to wait a year to get some of those responses, so I guess I'd look to Council staff to suggest a means to capture those responses.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:46] Thank you. I see the nod coming from Kerry, so Kerry.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:00:51] Sure. Thank you Mr. Gorelnik, Mr. Chair. Yeah, I made note of a few of those questions and they centered mostly around the upcoming review of the coordination plan with regards to, I think it's Section 405 of the National Marine Sanctuary Act and Fishing Regulations. That was just a request to keep us apprised. And then there were a couple of comments and questions about the Ocean Protection Council and how it relates to the goals of the 30 for 30 and the groundfish trawl survey data being used too for the deep sea floor community tracker. And then also a question about the groundfish association with corals at the end. So maybe, and I just repeated those to make sure that I didn't miss anything. We can listen to the recording of course and I can coordinate with Miss Fangman and Laura, but maybe a future Habitat Committee Report since it's on every agenda item might be the appropriate time to ask Laura and or Miss Fangman to come back and report. I don't know if that would be June or September but we can certainly work on that if that makes sense.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:16] Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:02:16] Or I would suggest maybe come in the form of an informational report as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:22] There you go.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:02:22] That might take up less floor time so that makes sense too.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:27] There's one for the efficiency box, we'll take that one. All right. All right, Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:34] Thanks Chair. I just wanted to just acknowledge the Habitat Committee Report quickly and just give verbal that we heard that. I think it's good things and we can pass that on to the sanctuaries and hear more from the Habitat Committee as they've indicated.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:56] Thank you Corey. All right, Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:02:58] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. First echoing all the nice things said earlier about the close coordination we've had with the sanctuaries and looking forward to that. But on that specific, I think Corey's comment covers it, but for Merrick or Kerry, just on that last paragraph about the Olympic Coast Sanctuary and the Draft Management Plan overlapping with a Council meeting, just hoping you all could follow-up on that? The fewer Quick Response Letters we have the better and it'd be nice to have that, if possible, overlap with the Council meeting.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:36] Thanks Corey. All right, not seeing any more hands. Kerry.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:03:41] Thank you Mr. Chair. If there's no other comments or questions from the Council members then I think that would conclude your business for this agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:49] All right, very good.

## 2. Research and Data Needs

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right, no public comments, which takes us to Council action, which is...will be on our screen here shortly. And there you go. And with that, I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:15] Thank you Chair. I want to express thanks to Miss Bellman and the SSC who have been working on trying to streamline this process. This is my third or fourth iteration of this agenda item, starting with the document where we had like 400 items, just one after the other bulleted in 40 1,600 page document that was unuseful. Then I got to be lucky enough to work with Mr. DeVore and some others behind the scenes trying to help create the research and data needs database, and it still needs some work. It has its uses and we heard in a number of our reports the folks want to keep it updated and used. It does need some refinement so hopefully we can do that. And now I think this is the next iteration of trying to make it even more useful. There's details in that database, but you may have to want to find those details, where the current iteration is a little more user-friendly if you're trying to look for a high-level topic to help support grant funding or to look for a project for a grad student, et cetera. So do really appreciate the work that went into that. And listening to all of our advisory body reports, some common threads I heard was the need to maintain our current sampling and data collection programs. I know there's a lot of uncertainty with funding right now, but that was in at least, I think, four of the AB Reports. Citizen science was another topic that came up in I think over half of them. How can we leverage our on-the-water folks? They're on the water all the time, where I don't get to go out on the boat anymore. There's ways that I think we can incorporate them. It would need to be done with some considerations on how we would use the data, how it could be informative to assessments, et cetera. Environmental DNA was another item that was in a number of the reports. This is still what seems to be a somewhat emerging technology, but it has the potential to give us a lot of information and some small....the sample sizes are small, the physical sample, but there could be a lot of information. I do know there's some expense in the eDNA. And then, as I mentioned already, the other item I heard was update and maintain that database. So I think what the SSC has laid out for us is in line with what we are trying to do and with what our advisory bodies have requested of us. And when it comes time I have a motion prepared.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:04] Okay, good to know know Lynn. Thank you. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:03:09] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And I was just sitting here listening to all the reports and some of the Q&A that you all had with some of folks that came up to the table. And this is a new approach that we're taking and it was in response to a letter that the Science Center Directors wrote several years ago to the Council asking that this be refined. And it caused Marlene and I to go to the Magnuson Act and say, what is this thing? What is it supposed to be? And I took an opportunity when I was in D.C. to meet with some of the folks that had been staffers in Congress that helped to conjure up this language. So in the interest of trying to answer, in particular a question that Mr. Niles asked of, I think it was Mr. Fina, what's the difference between this agenda item and the science needs and priorities item that will come up in a couple of days? I wanted to reflect on the Magnuson Act language with you for a minute, just in the interest of clarity. And so what it says is develop in conjunction with the SSC multi-year research priorities for fisheries, fisheries interactions, habitats, and other areas of research that are necessary for



management purposes that shall, A: Establish priorities for five-year periods. B: Be updated as necessary. And C: Be submitted to the Secretary and the Regional Science Centers of NMFS for their consideration in developing research priorities and budgets for the region of the Council. So as I look at this I think of myself, if I was in the position of being a Science Center Director, I'm using this document that's being created to try to organize my office, that's the ideal. And so I think what the SSC has done is a big step in that direction to help kind of scale up a bit and say, what are the things that the Council needs in order to do our business? And it's not limited to new ideas. So some of the things you heard about maintaining the core activities, that's an important part of this exercise. And so that doesn't mean that we don't do the database. The database is something that's nice to have I think, but the database that we had been creating isn't what the Magnuson Act had been calling for, in my opinion. So think of this as a strategic document that helps the Science Centers go, okay, if we're going to try to help the Council here's how we could organize ourselves and our resources to help deliver. So I offer that in the interest of just helping understand what it is you're trying to do here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:52] All right, thank you Merrick. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:05:59] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair, Merrick. Yeah I think, and I heard good discussion with the SSC about the same thing, but I'm reflecting on the experience of same as Lynn and the research and data needs over time, and would anyone ever agree that any of this efforts have identified the top priorities or not? I think I hope everyone would say no, because the prioritization process is difficult, and it's taken more time than it's probably worth. So I do like the direction you're going. Yeah, and I see that the statutory language about the Science Centers planning. But on the West Coast, I'm sure everywhere, it's not just the Science Centers that collect data, it's the states in large part. On the West Coast, it's the states who collect the fishery-dependent data, you know, the shoreside. So it could have value to more than just the Science Centers, and it has had values to academic researchers as well. And my question to Marc came to another thought, you know being a member of the EWG we did talk a little bit about this, and the way that you would, if you could take the time to identify priorities, the way you would do it is not all together at once looking at all FMPs and habitat and ecosystem altogether, but you would do it from the silos up and then integrate them at this time, and that's large part what's happening. And understanding how the SSC and Marlene did it, it was the Chairs of the SSC, the subcommittees, who did a lot of work in going through each FMPs needs and highlighting that. So it kind of happened, it seemed that way. But yeah, I don't see a reason on a small picture comment of why the AS's priority list would be any different than what we're going to talk about under G.5. They should be very consistent with one another, and if their priorities are going to be sardine stock structure, for example, that's what this document should say. It was just with the train of thought. But going back to how I started, I appreciate the efforts of staff and to change the direction. The database was, I think it's going to be too much work to keep updated it sounds like then it would be the value. But just, that was just a response to Merrick's thoughts there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:45] Okay Corey, thank you. All right, Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:08:49] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to reflect for a second on citizen science. I think that that is something that we heard pretty loudly and clearly in this conversation today. I thought it was interesting we really didn't hear much about it from HMS considering that they have been contributing as citizen scientists in our process. The Albacore Research Foundation has been in a couple of times over the last maybe five years to talk about

how they have contributed to the California Current Ecosystem Report. We have also contributed to archival tagging, which has been a partnership with NOAA. And I will admit that I am involved with the Albacore Research Foundation. But I also want to talk for just a second about how citizen science contributes at the international level for HMS, because I think it is a model that we could be looking at for ourselves. In the Western and Central Pacific we have SPC, which is the Scientific Research Group, that predominantly provides science to the RFMO. They put out a list of projects and prioritize them similar to the process that we are doing, and they do work with companies like TriMarine to go out and figure out how to get that research done by actively working with fishing vessels in our supply chain or directly with fishing vessels that we own, so it is a cross-section. I think, based upon that experience, the one recommendation that I would have, because it has been for the most part positive over probably the last 15 years of my career in terms of working with vessels and citizen science, is to make sure that we're very clear about what it is that we want done. When we first started with ARF we were doing a lot of science and not all of it contributed. And we were rather disappointed that we were spending a fair amount of money. We were putting our time out there. We were put ourselves out there in terms of gear, et cetera, and it was not yielding the results that we wanted. So I am fully supportive of citizen science. I think it's something we need to look at. I think people have a great idea of where we should be working, what we should be thinking about, and how they can contribute, whether that's with time resources or financially. But that clarity piece just would be really helpful moving forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:50] Thank you Christa. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:11:55] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So I guess I'm...I guess this is a little bit of a process question because I have not been through this process before. So I commend the SSC for a really high level but very relatable, good biteable chunks document relative to research data needs, but we did hear from the advisory bodies some tweaks that they recommended relative to what I consider a working document. So I guess my question is who takes up that particular responsibility? Or even, or does the Council need to direct that responsibility relative to kind of continuing to refine what I think is already a great document but clearly could use maybe some refinements relative to the advice of our advisory bodies?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:01] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:13:04] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And I'll also look to Marlene in case she wants to weigh-in, but this is the first time we've done this particular iteration, but what we have on the schedule is for this to come back for final adoption in June. And so a process that we had envisioned is that the SSC has brought forward a preliminary view as you saw here, we've gotten some reaction, and I think the next logical step would be to take that reaction plus any feedback that you may have and hand it back to the SSC to bring you something for final adoption in June. That will become your document so you do with it what you will, but that would be the closest iteration that the SSC would have to a final would be in June. Is that answering your question?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:13:50] Yes, it does. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:53] Thank you Sharon. Jen Quan.

**Jennifer Quan** [00:13:53] Yeah, delivering a few comments from our Science Centers. So first of all, NMFS appreciates all the work the SSC and all the others have done that went into streamlining the RDN document. As we were, NMFS, was one of the entities that was calling for it. We also,

as is called for by many of the advisory bodies, NMFS agrees that the large database should be maintained for now for reference. And as the SSC calls for a formal review of the new document by the agencies would allow for priorities to be matched through a strategic planning process going forward. And this, especially in light of given our significant budget and possibly organizational issues for NMFS in the near future, this, the last thing that I just spoke to, having a formal review of the document by the agencies would allow for better iteration and alignment as we move through what will be significant uncertainty and change for us. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:18] Thanks Jen. All right, Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:15:18] Thanks Chair. Just listening a little bit about the database concepts, we heard a little about it in the advisory body reports and it seemed positive to keep that alive for now at least. To my understanding the database has not been updated, so I'm wondering if it would be intent that Director Burden and Miss Quan just spoke to would be when this process is, when this process finishes at our next Council touch point, would it be the intent to take whatever the results are and update the database to include that? Just so that as the database is being used by whomever ends up using it, it would at least be sort of refreshed for that period of time.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:10] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:16:14] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I appreciate the question. I guess a few steps are going through my mind. One is, let's, for the immediate term, focus on finalizing this more strategic document that we have. And then I am hearing from you all that the database is something that continues to be desired. I don't have a good view in my mind about what we, where we would go from here, and I think it might just bear some....it might be worth just taking a step back a little bit and catching our breath and saying, what updates do we need to do? And so it might just be, you know, repopulating some new ideas. There might be interest in really reformatting the entire database. The latter one takes resources that I'm concerned we might not have. The former could be easier to do. So I guess what I would suggest is let's agree that that adds value, and after we get through this step we'll reflect on how best to move forward with the database. That's what's in my mind anyway.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:24] Okay, all right, thanks Merrick. Corey. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:17:24] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And heads up to Marlene for some help, but maybe I didn't quite understand Merrick's suggestion. I might have gotten the opposite. But what I heard from listening to the SSC discussion was that there's not enough staff to update the database. So like keeping it in place is one of their own SSC's time. So was your suggestion to keep it and then figure out....it does have value, but I guess my question is, is the value going to be worth the time that people need to spend on it to update? It was a question I heard posed, and I'm going to ask Marlene. I'll stop and see if she remembers that part of the SSC's discussion and I'm on the right ballpark of what it was? But I think it was, let's pick one way and kind of stick with it for a while, involve not putting a lot of time into the database. Did I, am I recalling that somewhat correctly Marlene?

**Marlene Bellman** [00:18:34] Through the Chair.....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:34] Marlene.

**Marlene Bellman** [00:18:34] Thank you for the.....Brad? Yeah, thank you Chair Pettinger. And thank you for the question Council member Niles. So the focus that we have right now is on the documentation of the preliminary research and data needs, which is essentially the format of that is in SSC Report 1. The utility and how we utilize the tool of the database in conjunction with this new framework that we've proposed in the new sort of format, I think that is still an open-ended conversation within the SSC as well as some of the other things we've been hearing. We heard some feedback from the advisory bodies to the Council in that regard, but my understanding is that we still have some flexibility and openness in terms of how we utilize that as a tool, potentially in addition to the outcome product that we've been sort of focused on as the result of this action and this item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:47] Thank you Marlene. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:19:47] Thank you Chair. One piece that maybe I didn't mention as Mr. DeVore and I were helping work on this, there was a contract with Pacific States and a computer programmer. I think it was like a two or maybe four-year contract, and it took a lot of that contractor's time. Mr. DeVore and I worked with on the groundfish spex database and what goes into the database but the building of the database, and I think that's a piece that still needs some work, but it was a pretty hefty lift for the contractor. So just, I had forgotten to mention that piece, that it wasn't all Council staff and GMT staff, but the computer programmer people who are way smarter than I am.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:41] All right, thank you Lynn. Marlene.

**Marlene Bellman** [00:20:47] Thank you. I also wanted to provide just a little bit more clarity to a question that was addressed earlier related to process. Yes, the consideration right now in our conversation is also a workload concern. It's a workload concern for the SSC as well as others about how to approach that. In relation to our next step between now and June, the SSC will not be meeting and so I believe that the intention here is that we would have a list of preliminary research and data needs that are the Council's research and data needs. And so I believe it would be up to me to craft an attachment for the briefing book in June that represents the Council's selected priorities, or your selected preliminary research and data needs. Those remain somewhat separate from the recommendations of the SSC. And so again, the SSC would have an opportunity to come forward, provide their recommendations to you on this topic in June, but I just want to clarify that I believe that we would be bringing forward now the Council's priorities, and those are somewhat separate from the SSC's recommendations on those priorities. Does that help with the process question from earlier? Or perhaps we would need to work that out internally.

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

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:22:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. So Marlene though, I understand kind of would the Council's priorities though, would we agree that the SSC's Report is a relatively comprehensive working step that then you would probably use as your base, and then if there were needs to integrate additional Council feedback, advisory....whomever, but relative to crafting Council priorities, that's how you would envision rebuilding the layer cake here?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:12] All right. All right Lynn, it's time?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:23:20] Not seeing any other hands raised, so I have a motion ready if we're to that point?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:26] I think we are.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:23:36] All right. So I move the Council adopt the Scientific and Statistical Committee Report 1, and include any edits and recommendations from the advisory body reports to generate the Council's preliminary priority document for review and final action in June 2025.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:54] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:23:55] Yes sir, it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:56] Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you. All right, please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:24:03] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think we've covered a lot of it. The intent here is to start with the SSC Report, and I'm assuming it's Marlene that will, or Miss Bellman that will get the workload to then try to incorporate what we have seen in our advisory body reports into that, and then in June we will have that consolidated document list to look at and adopt for final action. So that was the intent behind this.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:33] Okay, very good. Okay, questions for the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:24:42] Yes, thank you Chair, and thank you Miss Mattes for the proposal. So we're going to leave unsaid right now the fate of the database and take those steps in June? Thank you.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:24:54] Through the Chair, Dr. Lent, I specifically did not address the database at the moment. It is part of the advisory body recommendations in their reports, and based on some of the discussion and back and forth questions we've had, I didn't want to address that specifically under this motion at this time.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:16] Thank you Rebecca. All right, Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:25:20] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I was supportive of the motion of course. Thanks Lynn for doing this. And I don't know if we could have time for guidance or Q&A with staff after we vote, but I think that what Lynn noted in her opening comments that a number of the advisory bodies highlighted the importance of our core data collection and our monitoring, and to oversimplify it there's kind of a couple of....there's the core data monitoring, and then there's kind of research type of projects in there. And so I'm hoping, I think it's in there in the SSCs core document. I'm going to keep saying core, but that you would envision....this would be, I would hope that that document with staff in taking this motion into account would maybe highlight that importance of these core monitoring data collection programs and that would be consistent with their motion. So it might be better at the end to have some Q&A with staff about how this gets turned into words is kind of my question in that and highlighting that importance of like the PacFIN and the boring things like fish tickets and a little more emphasis on that in the document.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:54] Okay Corey, thank you. Anybody else? All right, I'm not seeing any hands so I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:27:02] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:04] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously so all right. So thank you Lynn. All right, Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:27:23] Thank you Chair. To get to what Mr. Niles was just asking about. Several of the advisory body reports did mention core or existing data collection programs, both fishery dependent and fishery independent, therefore I thought I was including that, but if we need to highlight it in June we can definitely pull that out and highlight it. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:53] Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:27:53] Thanks Mr. Chair. Thank you Lynn. And maybe, I don't know Marlene if, not to put you, not if you don't have thoughts now then no problem, but if you have any feedback or thoughts on how you might pull that out? And I'm also thinking of Jen Quan's comments about getting agency feedback on some of that. Do you have any feedback on how might emphasize those core agency data collection and tribal data collection programs, you know, kind of distinct from the research type of topics? Sorry, do you have any thoughts, any feedback at this time on how you might do that? And if not, then no problem.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:43] Marlene.

**Marlene Bellman** [00:28:43] Through the Chair, thank you for the question Council member Niles. I believe that likely the best scenario would be to consider adding some narrative language in the beginning about core or fundamental data and monitoring programs, something along those lines, as well as the sort of detailed and bulleted format that we have in relation to the SSC Report 1 and some of the specific guidance that was provided by the ABs about revisions to words or adding a bullet here or there. I would envision we would do those edits and recommendations and also add potentially some narrative section on the core and fundamental things that you've been addressing. That is just my initial thoughts on that, but we do have a fairly short turnaround on some of these materials, but I would be looking for some feedback as well on folks thoughts going forward. So that's just my initial response now. Appreciate that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:49] Thanks Marlene. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:29:49] I'm going to learn how to look at you and use the microphone at the same time, but yeah, that sounds perfect. So thank you for that response.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:57] All right, thanks Corey. All right, anyone else? Okay Marlene I guess back to you.

**Marlene Bellman** [00:30:06] Thank you. Under Agenda Item C.2 you've taken the next step in your research and data needs review cycle of adopting some preliminary research and data needs

from the Council, and we will be carrying those forward and revisiting this item again in June.  
Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:22] All right, very good. All right everybody, well done.

### 3. Socioeconomic Framework Workplan and Update

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] We have no public comment, so any other discussion to be had on this? This was just to check in on the status and for opportunity for you to provide any guidance on the next steps. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:19] Thanks Vice. I don't have much to say other than just appreciate Council staff for pulling this all together. I think the RFP looks good. As a social scientist myself I'm really excited about this and really looking forward to seeing what we get back and having the opportunity for the Council to continue to have iterative discussions around this work and how it moves forward. So just want to express my gratitude to Council staff and looking forward to see where this goes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:54] Thank you. Any other comments? Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:01:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I hope this is appropriate, an appropriate position to put it, but I know for years in the social economic stuff that Council does and other places in the fishing industry, for instance in my industry, the sport or charter industry, every bobby pin or brush or candy bar or whatever, gas bought from wherever the person lives from, leaves from goes into the cost or the expense of the trip that that person that spends in the economic value, which is great. I'm not saying that's a bad thing, but I always thought it was kind of disingenuous. Maybe we have a little time here that on the commercial side it was just X value, deckhands, nets, bait, insurance, moorage, all that stuff didn't go into that to show a true picture of what a commercial fat boat value is to a harbor or to the community or to what he or she does. And I don't want to dump any work on poor Gilly, but as time goes on, and maybe this is not the right place or the right subject, but he brought up the social stuff, I think it's time we think differently about that because all that, and it really comes into play when you lose a cannery and you lose bunch of boats, and of all that economic stuff that leaves your port. People going to Engle Marines, people hiring a boat mechanic, and all that stuff. And maybe some of that's not appropriate or applicable, but I know some is and I think I felt for a long time that that was wrong that we did it that way, and in a lot of ways I think we don't value the true value of our commercial industry by doing just X price value on the fish they sell. So just throwing that out there for your own amazement. If it sticks somewhere, if it eventually gets changed, or we think about it more when we do these kinds of things then I've got my message through and we have it. I tried. So anyway, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair for letting me speak. And I hope I didn't get too far off base, but you can hit me later. So thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:44] Thank you Butch. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:03:47] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. And I couldn't agree more with what Mr. Smith said. NOAA annually publishes a document called Fishery Economics of the United States, and it used to include both durable and non-durable expenses associated with fishing activity, in particular the recreational activity, and it doesn't anymore. They've dropped the durable and it's not clear to me that they even capture all. So to the extent that this process or this Council can encourage that, encourage the economic impacts of the activity that we manage is fully reflected in an economic analysis would be helpful because we are supposed to take into account



impacts on communities, and those impacts are directly felt by economic activity and that's not being captured right now.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:54] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:04:57] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And like the Executive Director I just can't help jumping in. You've already heard me whine about this at this table ever since I got here. I can only speak as an economist. Corey can cover the community social sciences aspect, which economists are really bad at. But what I'll tell you is there is a lot of abuse of what's called economic figures of value, of impact, of economics. There's a lot of abuse. It's really not very clear, not very precise. There's a lot of things that are just plain wrong. If we want to talk about expenditures, whether you're a recreational angler, charter boat operator, commercial operator, that's expenses, those are apples. Don't compare them with oranges. If you want to talk about the value, it's very different. The value of a commercial fishery is not the gross revenues. It's the net revenues with many modifications around that. So you've heard me whine when someone puts a chart up and says, here's the gross revenues and out of all these categories these people could not afford VMS or EM, I can't remember what it was. They can't afford it if that's their gross revenues, you've got to look at their net revenues, it's what people take home. Now I hope that one day, and this is something I did at the Marine Mammal Commission, I brought an economist in to just explain the nuts and bolts of it. What are the values? There's a lot of different ways to do that. And what are the economic impacts? That's important too. What's the multiplier effect? And I think there's a lot more strength in the impact values, but we have to make sure we're comparing apples with apples, oranges with oranges, and when we talk value, we're not actually talking expenditures. Expenditures are not values. It's an important figure in its economic impact. But let's get it straight and let's make sure we're true to our mission, which is looking at the bottom line, people's ability to take home a salary and put food on the table and get their kids through college and so forth. So I welcome that opportunity. Perhaps Gilly we can have the contractor give us a primer if only in writing of like with like and so forth. Thank you for letting me let loose on this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:21] Thank you. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:07:22] Thanks. Hesitating to say this now that Rebecca said it's all wrong, but just tying it back to what Butch was saying earlier this week about the thousands of pages and groundfish stuff and he can't wait to read one that he can understand. But we do have, for the good work of the Northwest Fisheries Science Center and the Southwest, I imagine there is the IOPAC model which does get beyond the ex-vessel revenues, and that's supposed to capture more than just the ex-vessel revenues. So agreeing with Butch and Rebecca that revenues aren't the whole story, but it is in there. Do we use it? Is it accurate? Bigger questions, but getting back to the point of this, I think, yeah again, echoing what Corey said earlier about thanks to the staff for putting this together. These special projects are new and I'm having trouble seeing ahead to what the outcome is. But I think the ideal would be to do what people would be to produce information that really helps understand our communities and economy and but also, you know, helps us weigh alternatives and which ones would be better. So yeah, looking forward to seeing what comes to fruit from this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:54] Thank you. Any other comments? Again, this was an item for guidance. I don't know that it was specifically addressed as guidance, but there were a lot of things discussed around here about a project that just the RFP is out and hasn't started. So my expectation is that

the Executive Director and staff will take that into account as we move forward. Gilly, do you want to summarize?

**Gilly Lyons** [00:09:26] Absolutely. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You just had a very helpful for me personally conversation about aspects of the project and opportunities to perhaps focus in a little bit on some specific questions, some of which are elucidated in the EFP, excuse me, the RFP, and which we anticipate being able to explore further once a contractor is on board. And we very much look forward to coming back soon with some more information about the contractor that will be selected and opportunities to talk further in the coming months. And then hopefully within the next year there will be some products to actually bring forward to the Council for discussion with the Council and advisory bodies. And with that, I think that you have completed your action for this agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:22] All right, let me look around. I always miss hands. Any last words? Not seeing any, thanks. We'll close out this agenda item.

#### 4. Adaptive Management Workplan and Update

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes all of our reports, the public comment, takes us to the Council tasks. Very simple, consider the updates, discussion on that, and any initial guidance on priority issues and actions for consideration. We had a nice long lunch hour to think about that so any hand to start the discussion on this topic? Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:00:30] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And if I may, I talked to a few people at lunch about this agenda item and I just had a question for Miss Lyons if that would be acceptable? So here goes the question. In the summary materials this was referenced as initial guidance, and I know, at least for the HMS folks, they initially thought that initial guidance was sort of the first bite at the apple, rather than, hey, we're setting a full scale course. So just hoping you can kind of clarify what the process will be moving forward in terms of additional guidance and where people can weigh-in appropriately?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:19] Gilly.

**Gilly Lyons** [00:01:19] Through the Chair, thanks very much for the question Miss Svensson. I would say that yes, as the Council tasks specify this is initial guidance on this on some of the next steps on this project, and there will be additional updates and check-ins going forward. I believe the next one that's agendized is scheduled for September of this year. There's sort of a general cross-FMP item. I don't recall if it's shaded or not, but I believe it's on the September agenda regarding, it appears as, FEP Project Updates, which is sort of placeholder name for these projects, and that would be another opportunity to check-in I believe on all three of the projects at that juncture. But in general, the way this particular project is structured, the adaptive management project, is that it is, there's.....going back to that sort of circular image in the slides, there's this sort of three-part sort of peace symbol kind of arrangement where there will be, we understand sort of a body of work moving forward that looks at some bigger picture sort of like how might we do things differently than we have and that's going to be, probably with the help of an outside contractor and other expert input, and we'll also be involving conversations with advisory bodies and perhaps even with the Council as well and definitely with Council staff and others, and I think a lot of ideas are going to get generated through the development of that piece of work, but then simultaneously perhaps, or concurrently, there will also I think be opportunities to think about other nearer-term opportunities within specific FMPs to move forward and so if there are challenges that people want to try to elevate. So I think that a few of those things are probably going to be a little bit braided together, and but there, and but there will be definitely opportunities both on the Year-At-a-Glance but also potentially under individual FMP items as well. So yeah, I think there will be other many bites at this large and shiny apple.

**Christa Svensson** [00:03:53] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:57] Rebecca Lent. First let Executive Burden also chime in on that.

**Merrick Burden** [00:04:05] Yeah, thank you. And apologies Dr. Lent for stepping in front of you. But I did just....I do think that with as with most of our work there will be times and places where we are, you know, iterating between the analytical team and the Council, but I would just like to remind everyone that we do have a pretty hard deadline here. We do expect to have funding

available through 2027, but that anticipates that we get an extension. So we do need to make headway, and that does depend on us saying here's a general course that we want to pursue and then we can iterate within that course, and what exactly that looks like? I guess we'll talk about that here. But I do feel the need just to remind everyone that we have to make headway. We received the funding late and we are in a place where we have a project deadline that doesn't seem too far away at the moment.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:07] Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:05:09] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you Miss Svensson for raising the issue of HMS and the others who might not have had a chance to weigh-in. And I had an opportunity to ask Miss Lyons just before we started the meeting about the third project formerly known as IRA. And I assume that will be on the agenda next week for the FIW meeting? But that project also has some potential cross-cutting opportunities, so will it be brought to the full Council as the plans are developed? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:45] Gilly, you want to tackle that one?

**Gilly Lyons** [00:05:48] Sure, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Through the Chair, thank you Dr. Lent for the question. Yes, well it's interesting because the way the work being done under that particular project, much of it is being brought forward by the Fisheries Innovation Workgroup, the Ad Hoc Committee, and its focus on both the HMS Roadmap and the HMS EFP process and framework under COP 20. And so interestingly that, a lot of that work will show up. I haven't looked specifically at the year, or I don't have the Year-At-a-Glance as well in my head as I should, but that work will oftentimes show up under an HMS item because of it's being sort of housed within the FIW's charge at the moment, but there's also another prong of it related to dynamic ocean management tools and ways of being able to integrate some of those tools into some of the Council's work, even more so than is currently done. And that I believe, that sort of the next time that that prong of it shows up I want to say is the November 2025 meeting. So I should say first and next time, because that hasn't been a standalone issue yet as far as I remember for the Council. So there's a couple of places on the Year-At-a-Glance where I think you'll see those pieces from Project 3. I'm using air quotes. But what we have been calling Project 3, IRA Project 3 which is the bycatch reduction mitigation and EFP and dynamic ocean management piece. So I hope that's somewhat helpful. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:39] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:44] Thank you Vice-Chair. I don't mean to be pedantic on this, but we need to come up with some common language of what we're calling these projects. I was looking at the Year-At-a-Glance in the September or June and September, and I saw the FEP initiatives on one of them and I wasn't sure if that was follow-up on what our Ecosystem Work Group has been using or what is no longer called IRA, et cetera. Not something we have to finagle here on the floor of wordsmithing that, but some common language so people who....I consider myself pretty involved in this and somewhat in the know and I was struggling with what that one was about. So if we can get some common language of what these projects are now called, that will help our public and all of us know what we're talking about and when. And if I may, a couple more comments Mr. Vice-Chair?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:42] Go ahead.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:43] Thank you sir. Supportive of continuing this work. I know there's some specific examples that are floating around out there. We need to keep the broad look too, as well as those very specific examples that keep coming up because what we're doing now isn't working for all of our fisheries. So hopefully through this process we can find some solutions to be more timely and reactive to what we are doing. I really like the if-then statements being put into things. We use that in the halibut catch sharing plan. If this point is reached, then we do this action. It still isn't instantaneous. It still takes us a couple of weeks, but it doesn't require a Council meeting. So that is....if we can somehow build something in that and be legally allowed to use that for groundfish or CPS, that could be helpful. A programmatic EIS, that would be a whole lot of work up front to hopefully create some efficiencies both in Council time and in our management as we move forward. Just based on some experience with the tiered spex EIS from back in 2015 or so, we need to think broadly. We thought we were being extremely broad in some of our thinking, thinking of like canary rockfish, oh we'll never have an ACL above like 500 metric tons, and the next assessment comes out and it was 1500 metric tons was what the ACL could be. So one pitfall and one challenge we'll have to do is making sure we're thinking broad enough, maybe even broader than we've been doing to make that tiered process or that programmatic EIS and being able to work under that umbrella. It was a whole lot of work up front, but it did make the next couple of spex cycles a little easier because we could tier off of what we had done previously. So thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:43] Other hands? Discussion? Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:10:51] Thank you Vice-Chair. I don't want to cut off discussion, but I have a motion when folks are ready.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:56] It seemed like we were in a pause in discussion so let's hear it.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:10:59] Great. Can you guys pull it up? Yeah, this might help people discuss. And I notice.....I'm wondering if before I read it to you can you add the word, "guidance" between "following" and "statement" in the first sentence? Okay. So I move the Council adopt the following guidance statement for its flexible and adaptive management project. Develop an action plan for exploring and implementing the general tools for increasing flexibility and adaptive management identified in Agenda Item C.4.a, Supplemental Attachment 1, as well as other tools in all the Council's FMPs. The focus should be on increasing the Council's ability to quickly respond to environmental changes and unexpected and unintended events. Include exploration of ways to improve timeliness of fishery-independent and fishery-dependent data streams, and include local and tribal knowledge. Prioritize the groundfish FMP for this evaluation. And then for any tools developed prior to completing this report, for example, the groundfish harvest specifications flexibility action, consider benefits across other Pacific Fishery Management Council FMPs and concurrently amend those FMPs if appropriate.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:26] Thank you. As I followed along the language appeared accurate and complete. Do you agree?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:12:32] Yes, I agree.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:32] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:12:41] Thank you Vice-Chair. So I'll just start by saying I appreciate the comments that the groundfish fishery pulled together and offered at the beginning of this meeting. I also really appreciate the Ocean Conservancy paper that was offered in public comment too. I think both set us up really well and provided a really good backdrop for me to think about how to structure a motion around this dedicated funding. I appreciate Jilly, or Gilly's presentation at the beginning of this too, and just the reminder that there's a lot of work that's been done already that we could use as a foundation for this. Lynn just mentioned thinking broadly enough, and I think there are some places like the Council's Climate and Communities Initiative where we did some broad thinking that was outside of the bounds of numbers too that could help sort of inform that broad thinking in the future, so I just want to make sure that we end up pointing back to all of that in thinking about this action. The goal of my motion and planning specifically for specifications flexibility is balancing strategic evaluation, so that's the first line in my motion, with the longstanding need that we have in a lot of our fisheries. So there's a lot of need that appears urgent. I think, you know we had that in the discussion this morning for CPS there. It appears to be this urgency around the issue of setting stock structure. There appears to be urgency around shortspine and canary for the groundfish fisheries, but those are actually issues that have been persistent for years and years and years. And so we're getting to this point where, again across sides of the spectrum, we're now agreeing that like we need to step back and put a little pre-planning into the way we do things so that we're not managing piecemeal or responding to emergencies in the same way. I really love the peace sign circle that Gilly put in her presentation. Just, yeah, displaying that it's this balance between an overall look, things that can happen in a lot of places and things that can happen only in one place, so I think if we think of that, these pieces can all fit together and we won't leave anyone out in that way. So if you scroll back up, my first bullet. So that is meant to acknowledge that there are great ideas in the staff paper but there are other ideas that we can bring to the table. And I want this look at everything to be inclusive of like, again the work that we've done before, other ideas are out there, and the ideas that we considered in this discussion. The first sub-bullet, that references both environmental changes and that's consistent with the language that's in the initial IRA Project formerly known as IRA. And then there's this other line, this unexpected and unintended events line that I've added in, and for me that is inclusive of things that, like my experience here on this Council has been that there have been things that have like walloped us that we weren't expecting. To me the pandemic comes to mind right now, market changes come to mind. So to me the driver doesn't matter so much as the fact that we're equipping ourselves to respond to a number of different things that could happen, and that the Council can react quickly to support managing our stocks and helping out the fishing communities that we support. The data sub-bullet, so the second sub-billet, is meant to just really reference our changing financial world and that, you know I know that we don't have, the Council doesn't have control necessarily of the data streams that NOAA collects or that are available, but that just acknowledges that there is.....our ability to manage quickly does depend on our ability to get information that supports our management choices. And so this is really just to say like we should be seeking, if we're limited in money, be smart about how we're gathering data and then bring in the community a little bit more into how that data is collected. So, yeah, pulling in tribal knowledge when it's possible, pulling in citizen science if it's possible. I heard the South Atlantic Council was doing, and earlier this meeting I heard that South Atlantic Council was considering a citizen science type initiative that I think we should try to reach out to them and look at to see if we can think about how to incorporate that kind of information into our system as well. And then in the fishery

independent data I know that NOAA has long talked about things like autonomous vehicles, eDNA that don't require as much funding as a survey platforms, but just a nod to the fact that we should be thinking about how that stuff can help us too here. The third sub-bullet, prioritize groundfish, because it's my favorite. Just kidding. That is not why....(laughter).... I do agree with the GMT that it is the most, it's the fishery that I see right now that has the most potential to receive outside benefit, outsized benefits from this exploration. But I do think that there's of course places that we can apply a lot of the syncing to other FMPs too. I just see a big chance for it in groundfish right now. And then I also am thinking about some things that are going on in other FMPs. Again, Rebecca pointed out that HMS has this additional entire IRA-focused project focused on it that does overlap with this as well, but I think that some of the thinking and effort is going on over there for that FMP. CPS, we talked this morning about the need to really focus in on stock structure for sardines. So for me that ranks in priority over thinking of applying for tools here. I think we should ultimately think about CPS a lot more deeply around these issues because CPS is the most like groundfish in its management style, but I do think that they have other problems that we need to address for them first. And then yeah, I recognize that the international and co-management structures for salmon and HMS do make it a little bit different from what we have the latitude to take care of in the groundfish and CPS FMP. So with that in mind and the needs for the groundfish FMP around some of the species that it's dealing with, I think it makes it a good candidate for the first focal look, or for one of the first passes at this. And then I wanted to address specifically, because a lot of....I think there has been confusion during this meeting and a lot comments, again, the public comments from the groundfish fishery at the beginning of the meeting were really tied to the specifications flexibility action. There's a lot lack of clarity around the overlap between that and other initiatives. I left, I tried to keep this motion or this guidance motion clean and just focus on what this study should be itself, but I do intend under H.3, when we're talking about workload, to really push forward on that specifications flexibility action. So again, thinking of Gilly's peace sign, this is the place where we're doing the overarching look. That is a specific action for one FMP that could be really helpful to them right now. It also may be helpful to multiple FMPs. And so I think I'm asking us to do a couple kinds of thinking at once and you know really believe that we're not leaving anybody out if we look in one place. And I think, yeah one thing I've been mulling over as we've been walking around the hallway too and talking about this is that I think Council staff, it'll be really attendant on them to....you know if there are places where.....it might take us sort of noticing things this cross-FMP, even if they concern a single management plan, if there's a possibility that there are like parts of that action that could ultimately help other FMPs in the future or just really drawing those other FMPs into the conversation a little bit more so that we can think through how to efficiently manage things for them as well. I did, as we've been mulling this over again, there was a South Atlantic Council FMP that includes all of the tools that the groundfish, that the GAP put forward in workload planning last time, and the South Atlantic Council was able to amend three FMPs in a single action to add those flexibilities in. They did it in a really elegant way. I think that specific spex flexibility action could happen really quickly for our groundfish fishery if we design the action with some similarities to the setup there, and in that way could quickly put those tools in the toolbox for other FMP's without, again, creating outsize workload, detracting from benefits that could be felt in other places too. So I just, there's a lot already out there that's been done and we should be grafting off of all of that as we think through this action so. And I welcome counters to how I've framed this. This was just meant to be a starting pass at discussion and I'm eager to hear your thoughts. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:11] Thank you Aja. Before we get to discussion, any questions for clarification on the motion? Rebecca Lent, then I'm guessing Corey Ridings. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:22:24] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And Miss Ridings may have some of the same question. Can you go back to the top just to make sure? I just want to make sure I understand some terms in here. The top talks about develop a guidance statement. Okay, and then the first bullet says develop an action plan. And then going on down it says prioritize groundfish for this evaluation. So there's guidance, report, evaluation, and then the final bullet talks about tools. For any tools developed prior to completing the report. So can I just get clarification on what those terms, particularly "report" and "tools"? Thank you so much for the motion Miss Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:23:12] Of course. Yeah, thank you. And thanks for that question too. So the very first block, the guidance statement is meant to be all the bullets below. So that's our guidance statement. So what we're adopting, I think, is the first and second bullet and the sub-bullets in between. That first bullet and its sub-bullets in my mind are our report that covers, so if we go back to Gilly's diagram where there's overarching reports, cross-FMP things, and then individual things, I view this, that first bullet as that overarching report, that overarching look at everything. And I'm asking in those sub-bullets though to like think about groundfish as the... I think we're going to have to talk about these things in practicality as we move through this report. This is my vision for it. I think we're going to have to like get into a little bit of detail to think through how this would work. And I am saying that the groundfish fishery could provide a good example, space to look at these concepts because, and yeah, I discussed this a little bit, but it's like, it's the most traditional Magnuson FMP that we have. People may argue with that, but I think it's the most traditionally set up to fit into this other than CPS, but again I think CPS has some other issues there. And then the tools, the tools part of it is the spex flex action. I envision that as being a single FMP action. And so that is, so again in this circle, in the peace sign, single cross-FMP and overarching, so that final bullet is, the tools one is a single FMP action potentially, unless there's an opportunity in that case to extend some of the tools that we put into place in another FMP. And one thing that comes to mind, for example, is the phase-in reduction of quotas across multiple years for years when there's a quota reduction. That's a tool in a toolbox that could go in the CPS or groundfish FMP and should be a fairly easy addition to those FMPs. I don't actually know offhand how the FMP's are set up for both and whether or not there's reg language necessarily that's there, but that can either exist as like a single FMP action if we decide that that tool isn't useful for other things, or it could be in that multi-cross-FMP area of the peace sign if we determine, if the Council determines that it's the kind of change that should be implemented in that other place as well. And so yeah, I was trying....yes, thank you for those questions. I was trying to like navigate the like, that circle. Gilly put together that circle separate from....I did not see it until today and I was like, ooh that's the way, like that's a good way of looking at it, so I really liked that display because it does, it does really crystallize for me in my head where I want different things to sit.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:33] Thank you. Corey Ridings, then I'll look to my left. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:26:37] Thanks Vice. Thanks Miss Szumylo for getting us started and bringing this out. This is really helpful. My first question I think is a little bit like Dr. Lents, so I just wanted a little more additional clarification, and if the tower of power can scroll back to the top. So I have a little bit of confusion over, we have a motion to adopt a guidance statement, and typically those things are a little bit different in this process. And I know that words are sometimes, or are frequently, depends on their context, so I'm wondering if you could provide us with a little of clarity about your intention around, in this context, what is a guidance statement?



**Aja Szumylo** [00:27:22] This is not....this is a case where I don't really....I didn't come into this situation with a specific intent around that necessarily. I know that typically we put guidance statements up and we just agree on them and just wordsmith them together. I thought that there might be some disagreement here and so I wanted to do it in a motion so that we could kind of capture that disagreement appropriately and discuss it the right way. It was more to force it into a process for discussion than anything else, but not....I didn't do it with any intention. If there's a different way that it should be done and you guys think that we should not do it as a motion and just wordsmith a guidance statement, open to that too.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:06] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:28:12] It's a sort of a related follow-up question, which is just another question on the wording and intention. The words "action plan" you've used here, we also kind of already have the grant application which lays out a process and a timeline and some, I'm not sure if the word "deliverables" is used, maybe "objectives". So how do you envision, so I think this is asking staff to develop this action plan, so how do you envision that action plan dovetailing with sort of the existing grant application and the timeline and the items that are in there?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:28:52] I'd have to go back and look at that, but my thought was that some of the tools that come out of this action plan will require FMP amendments, may require COP adjustments, that kind of thing. And so what I'm looking for is Council staff to say, here's the time over which we think that we can complete the work to enact the things that we're coming up with, or here's our recommendation for how that work should flow. Because there wasn't any spec.....or I'm imagining again, I'd have to look back at the action plan that was laid out in the grant proposal, but I'm imagining at the time there wasn't.....I mean part of why we're here discussing this is because there probably wasn't specificity around what exactly those tools would be. And so I think we're at the point now where we're like, this is what this looks like, these are the kinds of things we might consider in a different, in specific FMPs, and here's how we would need to do that, like rulemaking and actual COP adjustment-wise. And so, yeah, the difference I see is this one is refining specific FMP amendments, specific changes to the way that we do things, and coming up with a plan for how the Council would take that up and review it. And again, I think this kind of goes to the discussion of like using the groundfish FMP in this case. You can't really do that planning around how to implement those things without really thinking, like you need an example thing to think through. We can talk in, again, in non-specifics about phase-in ABC control rules, for example, but until you're actually applying it to the FMP and actually thinking through how that would play out for the species that you're thinking about, then you can't really say how that would, yeah, how that would flow through the Council process, how NOAA would pick it up for rulemaking, where we'd actually implement those things. So my idea here is like, it's really like the extension and refinement of whatever was in that document before around, like around an actual example.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:04] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:31:04] Thanks Vice. Thanks Miss Szumylo. That's helpful to sort of understand the intent in your thinking. One sort of thing around that, and it sounds like we haven't, that grant application maybe you haven't looked at it in a hot moment, but just like part of that was to say, a quote from there was, "the outcome is a decision-making framework". And so I'm hearing

you say, I think yes, okay let's think about specifics. It is my hope that this work still does do a more larger FMP, a more inclusive framework that we can then apply to each FMP and get tools sort of from that direction, so to speak. Does what you're suggesting here fit with that? Or am I describing something that is not what you had in mind in terms of the relationship between the tools and the action plan versus our stated sort of outcome for a decision-making framework?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:32:02] Through the Chair, through the Vice-Chair, thank you. Yes that, I think those match. I think that there's, yeah, I think there's good synergy between what you were describing was in the RFP and what I'm thinking about too. And so, yeah in my... I keep talking about this outside of here as packing a go-bag, and I still think that that analogy works well, but like if we plan through the kinds of things that could go in a go-bag, and I think that list of items that was included in the Supplemental Attachment 1, that is a list of the type of things, the type of changes that we could make. And I think from there flows through, like okay within this FMP here are things that are appropriate, here are how they could fit in. Here's how we could go forward with implementing that set of things for this FMP. Here are the things that fit in this case. And so I would hope that the end result of this would be some look where we're able to drill down through the specifics of each FMP and think about the practicality of applying any tool that we come up with overall across other places as well. I've also, yeah, one other thing I want to say that wasn't really included in this motion, well actually no, it is a little bit included in this the final bullet point of this motion where I'm saying like, if you find a thing that works here for efficiency do it in this other place too. I really, I think that that is a way of being more than just like a....like to me that's a....the language you use was a decision-making framework, but to me it's like if we decide that our, if the Council decides that what we're doing is trying to prepare our FMPs to deal with shocks to the system, wherever those shocks come from, then that thinking should be pervasive through how we choose what to take up, what plans we choose to make. So I do think that there is a framework thinking that comes out of this over top of everything. It's saying like, It's our business to create resilience for these fisheries. And so, yeah we use that overarching thinking to guide how we, how we dig into our FMPs and how we adjust them in the future so. But yeah, I do think that there's synergy between what I'm describing here and what you were describing was in the plan before. I'd have to go back and look at it a little bit more closely though.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:38] Thank you. Let me look to my right. This is a wide room so it's hard to go back and forth. Questions for clarification? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:00] Thanks Vice. Sorry, I didn't want to jump in front of somebody else again. Miss Szumylo you spoke to this in a couple different ways. I just wanted to have clarity on this because this was brought up in our open public comment and clearly there's a lot of folks interested in it, which is this groundfish specifications flexibility. And can you tell me a little bit more about what you think the relationship is? Because here it seems like, if we scroll down, sorry tower of power, I think it's the last bullet point which you said was sort of separate in response to Dr. Lent's question and just saying, okay for any tools developed prior to completing this report, and then you use that as an example, consider the benefits across other FMPs, which makes sense to me, and then something you said in response to Dr. Lent made me think maybe I misunderstood that. Could you just provide a little bit more clarity on that relationship?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:53] Yeah, I'll try to say it again. So again, the thing that's sticking in my head is the peace sign. The first bullet is the overarching framework part of the peace sign. There's the cross-FMP part and then there's the single-FMP changes part. So to me, the spex flex action, I

think the way that industry is thinking about it right now, the way that it came up under the groundfish discussion in the GAP was as a single-FMP adjustment, however there are tools in that they wanted to think about and concepts that they are looking for that could be beneficial to some of the other FMPs. I don't think that they are beneficial to all of the FMP's. I watched salmon play out this week. I am still frankly surprised at how, like it is a very intense process. It is very different from my experiences around other FMPs and I think that, like I wouldn't even know where to start with adjusting and tinkering with that. And this is strictly speaking in terms of traditional, like the traditional management structures that come under Magnuson, I'm looking at FMP's that are shaped like that. CPS and groundfish come to mind as easy places where the same concept could apply in both places. So in a case with like the specifications flexibility action, again, something like phase-in ABC control rules might be easily applied in CPS. And in that case we could pull that item out and amend the COPs or the FMP amendment text to cover that tool in both cases. So in that case like we could do changes that would push that action into cross-FMP, but there are other changes too. If we decided, like carryover for example, if carryover really only worked for groundfish, was really only helpful there, that would fall in the single-FMP quadrant of this kind of, or the pie piece of this kind of work and it wouldn't apply over in other areas. So I think, yeah there....I recognize that there are going to be logistic challenges to scoping something as a....we're not going to be able to scope something as a single-FMP action and then flip it over to be a multi-FMP action later. We might have to do a little hard thinking about how to balance that if there are tools that we think in scoping match both places. But I think that, yeah, to me it's.....think of the tool, think of a tool, think of whether it's helpful in one FMP or multiple FMPs, and I think that's what shunts it out into either the cross-FMP or single-FMP area. And then, again, the overall thinking for what this is is in that third piece of the pie.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:54] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:03:54] Thanks Vice. Thanks Miss Szumylo. That's very helpful. I guess just getting down to sort of procedure. I appreciate what you just outlined conceptually, that makes a lot of sense to me. Procedurally it sounds like what would be included is separate under a groundfish item that we are, I think it's agendaized for the next meeting and we're talking about that I would guess tomorrow when you indicated, when you first talked to this that you were planning to support that, that that is sort of a separate item and that you're just saying, hey, if and when we do that let's think about these other FMP applications of those tools as we get down the road on those items. Is that accurate?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:04:37] Yes, that's accurate. And yeah again, I think Christa raised this earlier, that there are some things about the other IRA project that look adaptive managementy. And so I think once we write up our successes under this effort we might say, like hey, we made these changes that also look like this. So I think there are all these ways that I think a lot of things probably can fall under this banner. But it just, I think to me the difference is like how we move forward with them, whether we move forward with them in a single place or we move forward with with them in multiple places at one time. I think the discussions around EFPs too and, like I think there are probably some discussions around adjusting the COPs for EFPs under the other IRA agenda item. If they come up with some efficiencies, then like let's do them in other places. Like I don't see.....I think they should....what I was saying about the systems thinking of it is that everywhere where we can find efficiency we should be pushing it out into other places. We should push good ideas into other places whenever it's possible. I do see this rhetoric too of like, I feel like we throw shade at the other FMPs sometimes when we're like, well we don't do that that way

over here, but sometimes we could do some things the other way in some other place if they're good ideas. Like I think we should better at just honoring that like maybe somebody else is doing things better and let's steal that idea over here to make things more efficient. So it's meant to go in all different directions and across a lot of different actions.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:19] Any other questions for clarification? Keep going.

**Corey Ridings** [00:06:27] Thanks Vice. Thanks Miss Szumylo. Just really appreciate you providing this kind of deep thinking about where this is coming from. There's, you know, you did a great job. There's like not that many words on the page but a lot of thinking went into this so I think it's really important to get that out. I have a specific question about the line you have here, "and including local and tribal knowledge". Just thinking about that and what you mean by tribal knowledge and if it has a connection to indigenous knowledge and what you were thinking about those concepts? I just feel it's important that we recognize indigenous knowledge as its own set and different from local or on-the-water knowledge potentially, so looking to just hear some clarifications from you on what you were thinking about those words?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:07:18] Through the Chair, thank you. I was meaning to be inclusive of all kinds of knowledge that aren't collected through our very, you know our state, federal means. So it's meant to say we're going to have to reach out to a lot of different places to pull in information in these times. So if there are ways to gather information and to honor that there are different ways of understanding what's happening with the ecosystem, that may help us make decisions about our FMPs that we should strive to try to pull those in. And yeah, a lot of this started with, you might have heard questions that I offered earlier this week with the citizen science. I was thinking there initially that, you know we've had.....now out in industry I've heard cases where people are like, I'm doing this thing, or I'm out there I can pick this information up for you. And I think that there are a lot of, it's not just our fishermen out on the water, it's a lot of other people who can offer information that might be useful to how we think about our systems and so what I was hoping to do here is to say like, let's use this chance to also think about different ways of understanding our world so that we can respond quickly to it. And I don't know what will come of this one. This one is just a sort of what ideas are out there? And yeah, to be more clear, initially I was thinking through what I heard earlier this week about the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council doing a deeper exploration of how to bring citizen science into their management system, but out here, yeah the citizenry and the stakeholders look a little bit different so I was trying to broaden that scope a little bit in this item. I'm open to wording differences too if you think something else is clearer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:26] Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:26] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'll give Miss Ridings' voice a break for a moment. Although my question, I'm not 100% positive if it's a clarifying question or if it should be part of discussion, I'm trying to figure out what is meant by improved timeliness of data streams. So I'm not sure if that's part of discussion or clarification?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:51] We've had a lot of questions for clarification, a lot of explanation of that. Let's just transition into discussion and if that includes questions please ask them, but let's hash this item out so we thoroughly vet it. So go ahead.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:13] Thank you Vice-Chair for the guidance, and hopefully Miss Szumylo still remembers the question I just asked.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:10:19] Yeah, timeliness. I think I was thinking when I wrote that I was thinking about.....again, I have a very groundfish lens with this. It's really just recognizing that, yeah we sometimes get into assessments and don't have data process in the way that we should to incorporate into assessments or all of the pieces that we need to make the best decisions. And so.....or we have data sources that we, like we don't think about ahead of time in order to vet them to incorporate them into our management structure. And so what I mean by timeliness is thinking through how to make sure that we have information that we can use to adjust management in this system at the time that we need it. I don't....part of why this is guidance is because I don't know what that's going to totally look like yet. And you know the answer might be like, we can't do this, this isn't possible right now or it's not possible within the scope of this, but I would like to think through are there ways and types of information that we can incorporate to augment how well we can manage things and can we get them into the system in time for us to make good decisions? So I'm open to thoughts on what that looks like. I just, I wanted to make sure that we were covering the data side of things as well as the management system side of things.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:46] Thank you for the additional information.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:50] All right, thank you. Questions and or discussion on the motion? Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:11:58] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I will be seconding, or not seconding, I will supporting, there we go. I've gotten discombobulated with all the conversation, but I will be supporting the motion. And thank you for the discussion that has gone on in terms of questions and clarification. And also thank you Aja for putting this together in terms guidance for moving forward. I am appreciative of the fact that it is relatively holistic, which when we sort of were putting Project 2 and a number of these projects together it was a holistic look at things of how can we do better for as many people in this process as we possibly can. So this was not necessarily geared towards a specific FMP, but how do we get as many people help as quickly as possible based upon some of the examples you gave today of different FMPs. Really that is kind of the heart and soul of this. When it comes to the third sub-point in terms of prioritizing groundfish, I am supportive of that as well. And I want to say thanks to Sarah and Heather and Jaime for really going out and doing the groundwork and a lot of the thinking on this, but also for being inclusive. I mean that wasn't just commercial folks, that was fixed gear, it was motherships, it was CPs, it was mixed gear. It was everybody across the board on the commercial sector. It was a variety of recreational types. It was, I think charter might have been in there as well. I mean it was basically all of groundfish saying, hey, we're interested in having this conversation. So I think using them kind of as a sandbox, for lack of a better term, which is how we described HMS when we were starting on the process for Project 3 makes a lot of sense because the need is there. You brought up HMS and Project 3. I've heard that come on the floor a couple of times today. I just, because we have a lot of new people in here, I do want to talk for just a second on it even though it is a little off topic, so I hope you don't mind indulging me. When we started that discussion it wasn't, it came from HMS, and it was our process around EFPs is not working. It focused then on, we have an opportunity in the world of HMS to go out for potentially somewhere, the last time I gave the numbers and I did not run them today, for between \$50 and \$100 million of what is essentially new money. These are fish that are out there that we have the ability to catch, but we

do not have a path through the Council process to allow people to really capitalize on the opportunity. And that is different than what we see in groundfish where people have the assets and we are looking on how do we create more opportunity for them. That being said, when we discussed EFP permits at the very beginning before it became an HMS topic, it was, hey, we've got trouble with EFPs in groundfish. We have difficulty at times with EFPs in CPS, so maybe we have an overarching EFP topic that has morphed, like I say, based upon the need around we have an opportunity. We've had more than just HMS fishermen show up to listen to what it is we're doing on Project 3 because it doesn't take necessarily an HMS fisherman to go out and get a swordfish, but it does take a fisherman, it does take the opportunity. So I think, you know similar to how we're talking about Project 3, I don't want people to think of that as it's only an HMS project, but I do want them to think about it under the lens of HMS because of that new opportunity for fishermen up and down the coast for coastal communities that I think most of us could use even a small part of that amount dollar-wise coming in our doors. I want to talk for a second here about our Executive Director's comments around we have a deadline. I agree we do have a deadline. We also agendized this as initial guidance. When talking to HMS folks, they used a Kit Dahl-ism of, we thought it was a nothing burger. This rolled forward in March I think for salmon people, and I didn't talk to salmon people, but their primary focus is on setting their salmon season. So I do think that it is appropriate if we need to course correct that we have that opportunity moving forward. I think those are probably the majority of my comments with the exception of just one little piece that's been nagging at me a little bit this week, and that is I've heard an awful lot about CPS and groundfish and we use the same management strategies, and I just want to urge some caution around CPS. CPS is a small forage fish but it is certainly not a shortbelly-sized hole that we should be jamming it in. And so when we're thinking about CPS, they may have different issues that come forward and need to be addressed and that we need to think about it using their own framework, because while the terminology may be the same, they may not be using it the same and we need to create space and opportunity for them the way that is appropriate for them. So with that I will close my comments, but thank you for the motion and thank you for everyone who has worked on this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:30] Further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:18:35] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I too will be supporting this and really appreciate all the work that Miss Szumylo put into working on this. I know I've had several meetings with you over the last few days as well as many others have. So while it may seem a little short in text, there's a lot of thought and work that went into this. When this first showed up, this, the last sub-bullet that's showing there, prioritize the groundfish FMP for this evaluation, when I first read that I was contemplating doing an amendment to the motion, which I'm not going to do, but adding groundfish and CPS for this evaluation. Based on the discussions, the clarifying questions, how some of the other language is written, I don't know that that step is needed. The language seems to be broad enough, and especially the last bullet there, that consider benefits across other FMPs. I think that does cover it. The trident? I don't think it's trident that would be the right word, the three piece pie that Gilly showed, I do think this as it's written addresses and provides the flexibility to be at that 100,000 foot level, the 20,000 feet level, and then the 10,000-foot level, you know the groundfish-specific FMP, et cetera. And hopefully we will learn some things using groundfish as our test case in this case. And then it may be tough for groundfish but maybe it'll be a little easier to incorporate some of these things. But just thank you for all of the work. And I really do appreciate the discussions and the questions that have been happening here on the floor this afternoon.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:24] Thank you Lynn. Chair Pettinger, then we'll look around for other hands.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:30] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I've got a favorite quote. I think it's kind of very applicable to where we're at here. You know we have rules for a reason and the rules are important. It's the reason why we have the rules. And unfortunately the rules get in the way of actually getting things done the way we'd like to have them done with the biological constraints we have before us. Aja I want to thank you for your motion, right? Gives us good direction here for moving forward on this. You know the fact that we can't move fish, carry fish that they've already been declared dead in the stock assessment forward is pretty frustrating for a fisherman, especially the IFQ system you see quota pounds come up. I know we've left 25,000 pounds of petrale in our account. We went into a new area and we hung into a sunken ship or whatever and lost our net and couldn't have time to get a different net to go get the fish. That fish is stranded, may not go into the community, crew. A lot of reasons for that weather. But it's not just the IFQ fishery that gets stranded, it's the states get stranded because we never fish up to the amount of fish we should be able to land just because we don't want to go over. So inherently we're stranding fish every year. I've looked at California last year, I was going through the CDFW report from March, the inseason report and as far as the, from 24 and 10,000 pounds of yelloweye, 140,000 pounds of black rockfish, 120,000 pounds of canary, half a million pounds of ling cod. I'm not saying I'm going to catch it all, but it'd certainly be nice to have those fish available given the scenario we've had with the salmon season in California. So I know that the spex flex discussions we had at the last Council meeting generated a lot of excitement. I said maybe hope would be a better word for it within the groundfish sector. And I think that that hope transcends to some fisheries but not all. Obviously groundfish is a simple one because the stocks live a long time and I think there's a little flexibility with a stock that lives a long time. Some stocks are recessed every year, whiting for instance. But whiting has a lot of stocks they catch with that, that they can definitely benefit here. So I just, I'm hoping, well I like this motion because it's starting to look at what are the options. And, you know we've....some people well we can't do this and we can't do that. I'm not sure what we can't do or can do yet. I think it's a good chance to look at that, see what we, what's available, what's possible, and within the biological constraints that have been set before us we can certainly live with those. And I think we certainly do justice to the people we serve, the communities we serve, and the fleets if we can find some better ways to get the fish to them while staying within those biological limits that we want to see. So anyway thank you Aja. Appreciate this. Thank you for the leadership at the Council as far as when they came up with this IRA proposal. I think it was very all encompassing and just looking forward as far as options to make things better because things, because they see that things could be better and I think we should be striving for that. So anyway, thank you and appreciate that and I'll be voting for the motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:14] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And not to correct you, but maybe to help the body in this transition, every so often I'll remind you there's special project proposals. Lynn Mattes trying to get our wording consistent here. On this side, I believe I had Sharon Kiefer and then Rebecca Lent. So we'll go in that order. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:24:35] If the tower of power could please scroll up a little bit please? And come down just a little bit. To me I like the motion. It seems to build upon the fact that we have a staff report that did certainly not comprehensively all the tools they found in their search, but certainly did lay out some general tools to kind of give us some, kind of a picture of some of the

types of things that would be coming forward to consider and look at applicability I think for this project. I stumbled a little bit on the include exploration of ways to improve timeliness, the fishery-independent and fishery-dependent because to me those are actions that would then enable tools, but I don't look at that as the tool. Do you see what I'm.....but, so that's how I think about that. I think it's appropriate to include it, but I think about it in terms of that context that having that timeliness is what is going to really amplify and enable the flexibility and adaptive tools. So, because I'm looking at things like, you know, she talks, Gilly in her report talked about FMP framework, some other types of things, those would be significantly amplified if we had more timely data streams. So I just wanted to kind of provide some insight in terms of how I am interpreting that particular component of the motion. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:33] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:26:34] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair and thank you again Miss Szumylo for the proposal for the motion. And thank you for addressing so many questions. What I like about this is that it is clearly stating that the groundfish FMP makes for a good test case, particularly since things are kind of locked and loaded in the pipeline. It keeps it open to making it more generic. I mostly appreciate that this is how we get started, and we do need to get started on all three of these. I have to use the right word, projects. And once we get started then we will have the proof of the pudding and we'll know where and when and how to share, as Miss Lyon said I think. It's exciting, we need to get started. So thank you for that proposal and I will support it. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:27] Cory Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:27:30] Thanks Vice. Just a few things thinking about as this conversation has moved on. I just want to sort of reiterate some of the things I've heard around having the need for other advisory bodies in management teams, and even the EWG, I think, didn't get a chance to weigh-in on this directly, but there's a long history of their involvement so I don't think we need to stop the train at this point. But I was appreciating what Miss Svensson was talking about and making sure that this does come back at various touch points to make sure that the other groups are, I don't want to say meaningfully included because it sounds like it wasn't until now, but I just want to take Miss Svensson's point about how it was noticed and just recognizing that this week has been tremendously difficult for all of our salmon advisors and they simply have not had the time or space to really dig into this and I think that they do deserve, they deserve a chance and also with the intention of this work was for all of that. So Miss Szumylo I heard that reflected in the comments you've made thus far. I just sort of wanted to underline the importance as this moves forward to make sure we are having those iterative touch points with all of our FMPs to keep that cross-knitting happening. I wanted to appreciate the section here on understanding of the data streams and the timeliness. That is something that I think is going to be also very important moving forward. I, you know, past have voiced that opinion about the need to better understand and make sure we're getting the data that we really need to do our best management and have that in a way that we can incorporate into our stock assessments and other decisions that we make around management measures or cross-FMP or whatnot, but I appreciate that, I think it's very important. I wanted to underline again, we had a brief conversation earlier, but just underscore sort of the importance of indigenous knowledge, and just noting that that is different than local knowledge. It has a very specific meaning. As a non-indigenous person I don't feel qualified to provide that definition, but just recognizing that there are other ways of knowing and that that knowledge is grounded in millennia of lived experience and deep history, and that is different from on-the-water



knowledge. And just as we think about different ways that this Council can incorporate different types of data and knowledge that, for example, are not necessarily feeding straight into a stock assessment, that we should be respectful and thoughtful about how those knowledge streams are being incorporated. Also noting that that was one of the Ocean Conservancy recommendations about climate-ready fisheries was to incorporate indigenous knowledge into management. Finally, I'm a little mixed here on where to go but I'm just going to put it out because I'm seeing a lot of intention towards probably moving forward with this as a motion. I'm reflecting on what Director Burden has shared with us I think several times over the past meetings about sort of the difference between guidance and a motion and that he takes a motion very seriously and follows it sort of to the letter versus guidance, which provides a little bit more, I guess ironically, flexibility in how Council staff moves forward with this. So I just want to voice that I have really appreciated all the comments that I've heard on the floor today. Miss Szumylo's clarification about the motion. And I hope that that discussion really feeds into how this is executed moving forward as a motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:21] Thank you. Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:23] Yeah, in my remarks earlier I just want to make sure that I wasn't picking on the state of California. It was the only numbers I could find easily within the briefing books that I looked at. So like every state has, every state's leaving those fish behind so I don't want to think Marci's, I'm picking on her or anything like that so.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:42] Thank you. Any other discussion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:31:48] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I've been quiet till now. Yeah like Lynn said, enjoying and appreciating all the work that Aja and Corey and others have done in talking to folks this week. But what Corey's last question is kind of something that's been on my mind of, you know I've been a part of the EWG in building, helping to build the FEP initiatives of the past and watching these now special projects come in and them not really fitting our system. And other than Brad's example of the carryover, I'm not really....I'm no knowing where this, the tangible things are coming from this. And that's a separate, that's going to be considered separately. But it's a long way of saying I've, in having the discussions this week in.....it matters when you get to details for, not to pick on Christa, but on her example of the EFP and HMS for example, you really got to get into details, and when people are saying it's not the Council process that doesn't fit, I was like in my perspective it's the Council moved really fast and it's the leatherback turtles that what makes it go slow. So long way of saying these are very involved and detailed discussions. And I want to also like have a half an hour discussion with Christa about how CPS isn't that different, but I'm not going to do it right now. But it's going to leave a lot on the shoulders of Council staff is where I'm going with this. And I'm trusting it was Council staff, Kit and Merrick largely, as I understand it, who put together these proposals and they did well at that. So going back to Corey's question, should they follow the letter of the....go to the letter of the motion or more tree-like guidance and use a professional judgment to kind of meet the spirit. I'm thinking it has to be more of the latter, that they have to have a lot of leeway to figure out how to do this. And sorry, there's one more example of on the timeliness issue, I'm also sitting here thinking we're starting to get news about our PacFIN and our RecFIN budgets, our grants that support the data collection that we use here at the Council and news isn't good. So it really, what....I don't know that people....people don't really understand our data systems in the first place so and what funds them. I don't understand for example the salmon side of our agency and all the many pieces that go into the coded-wire tags and all that. So it's, they're pretty....so that timeliness that's a huge issue

we could probably spend three hours talking about this afternoon and really it's going to take the.....another example of, I'm going to lean on Council staff and their long expertise to use judgment and guidance and not, I don't know how you described it Corey, but more of the literal interpretation, original intent type, Supreme Court type of jurisprudence. It's more of a.....I don't see how this happens without giving leeway to Council staff.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:01] Thank you Corey. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:35:06] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I do feel like there's been some pontificating about how I interpret this so maybe I should speak up. The way that I'm reading this is that Miss Szumylo has offered a motion for the purpose of making sure that this Council comes to a decision. But the way that I read the motion is it gives me and my staff the ability to try to figure out how to make it work. And it's a little bit different from how I usually interpret motions, which is tell me exactly what you want me to do and I'm going to go do that exactly or as close as I can. So that's how I'm reading this. And I think just given the complexity of this I'm not sure how to make it more specific, but I think the point I'm trying to make is that we'll take this, we'll do the best we can, and I think we have touch points with you all to keep us steering in the direction that you want us to go, but how to interpret this to the letter right now I'm not sure how I would do that. So I think there's some trust that's involved here with this motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:18] Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:36:18] Thank you everyone for all of the comments too. And I just wanted to say like maybe it's like we call them a special project, like this special project. All associated things that are in special project land get that marker so that people know to look there and to come into other spaces to hear ideas. And my vision of this, too, is the overarching framework for this is always taken up in cross-FMP, but like the individual actions until they touch multiple places will just stay in one lane. But if we can give some kind of designation that the actions that this Council works through are related to other special projects and make sure to call attention to them that way, then maybe we'll cover making sure that everybody pays attention in the ways that they should.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:11] Any further discussion? Not seeing any hands I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:37:22] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:24] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Aja. I'm going to give you a chance to think about your additional thoughts, but since we last reviewed our tasks it's been a while. Gilly, what else should we do?

**Gilly Lyons** [00:37:43] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I would say that you have had a robust discussion about this adaptive management project and you've definitely tackled the items on your task list. And you talked about next steps for advancing work under this project and some initial priorities for moving forward. And you just adopted a motion that provides guidance on several elements for initiating work on this project. And I believe with that, your work is complete.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:18] All right, with that I will look around once more though and see if there are any additional comments or discussion that needs to happen? And I'm not seeing any so we'll close out this agenda item.

## 5. Council Operations and Priorities

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, that concludes our reports, takes us to public comment. I don't think there's any there. I'll get confirmation. All right, that takes us to Council action, which is before us. All right. All right, with that I'll open the floor for discussion. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:25] Thank you Chair Pettinger. This may be....I was not around for the discussion that the Council had that led into this agenda item and so I don't, I may be asking a question that you guys covered before. And I'll tell you just a little bit of perspective of mine just listening to the advisory body reports. But I was raised on the East Coast in the East Coast Council system. The two Councils that I worked in, yeah, so everyone knows I was on management teams, the similar structure out there for the New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils and we never met concurrent as an advisory body with the Council meeting. So there was never, yeah just for context, other Councils do it differently. And I'm sure you've heard this before and I know people hate when we talk about how other Councils to things differently, but they make it work. The advisory bodies all make it work and are able to get information in for the Council to consider in time and without undue stress on their advisory bodies. And so I'm curious what exploration was done into other approaches overall? I'm not asking for a broad change here, but just want to know how much you guys considered or talked about the way other Councils do it?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:48] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:01:51] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the question. Seems like, it seems a very long time ago that we went down this road and we had what we call a Committee-Of-The-Whole meeting, which is basically the Council in a committee format so that you can have a conversation. And so most of the people here around this table were also at that meeting, so they might have some other input in addition to what's going through my head. But I found that conversation to be very fruitful and I thought it was a really good example of the Council members here really trying to problem solve and find ways forward, at the same time recognizing that we have a really good thing here. So I think it's that last point that puts some bounds on that discussion, which I can't speak for everyone, I don't recall us really considering a complete decoupling of our advisory bodies from the Council because I think there's a lot of good in our culture here when we bring everybody together and that allows us to do the good things that we do, and I recall a lot of people not wanting to abandon that including myself. So I don't recall a specific conversation about that but I do recall a sense of reluctance to really explore that idea.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:17] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:03:17] I just want to finish my thought there and I'm not, having experienced other Councils, I agree with the benefit of the overlap between the advisory bodies and the main Council. What I do more want to think about again is that I hear a lot of fear about the potentials for workload from the advisory bodies in making this shift, and I guess what I want to somehow convey to them is that, yeah the change is hard but it is possible and it may take some measure of effort looking out to other groups to see how they manage to do exactly what we do but with a different timeline and a different shape. And again I never, like this was foreign to me that this would all happen at the same time, and I certainly see how it creates a more tight-knit group and a better, like the conversations that happen are different. The communications across the groups are

different when you have everybody there at the same time. However, if the fear is the work, there are other models that we could rely on to pull even just like little bits of their shape to make it go okay. Mid-Atlantic Council, their meetings are like planes, trains, and automobiles to get to. They're like the furthest reaches of the like Mid-Atlantic Coast, like Duck, North Carolina, if anyone wants to look up where that is on a map, it is not easy to get to. And so a lot of people wouldn't go to those meetings, but we managed to have successful advisory body meetings remotely and in a cadence that matched what was needed to get the work done in between the meetings. So I just wanted to put that out there to any advisory body members that are listening and just maybe encourage like, it might even be worth having some kind of meeting where like the Chairs of the various advisory bodies could talk to Chairs of other similar advisory bodies to be like how do you get this done so that I can think about how to plan this cadence better? So that's all. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:26] Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:05:26] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Szumylo. I did just want to add that while we have not done kind of the wholesale untangling of having the Council meet concurrently with advisory bodies, you know we have been experimenting in the last two years with having some groups meet before the Council meeting and not meet in-person. So we have started to learn a few lessons about what those trade-offs are, what those benefits are. We have also been experimenting with having advisory bodies concurrent with the Council but for shorter periods of time. And again, we've learned some lessons from those experiences. We're starting to learn that sometimes there is great benefit in making sure that sometimes we have the Chair and Vice-Chair of a committee remain at the Council meeting to be able to interface with Council members even though the entire team or advisory subpanel might have gone home. So, you know I would say we have not made kind of that wholesale shift, but we are kind of experimenting to see, given our culture, given our arrangement, what is going to work for us.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:53] Okay. Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:06:53] Thank you Mr. Chair. And because Aja didn't have the luxury of being at that meeting, and some of the conversations that I remember is, you know I think there are times for different committees where it's kind of an off-meeting, like SAS March and April is a full-blown and they can readily meet online in the June meeting if there's a topic or September meeting. And sometimes they have to come to the November meeting, but not very often. But I think it's, although I've never been back east to see how those work, but I've heard there's a little more lobbyist type representation at those more so than our fishermen participation. And just looking at the Council table fishermen are kind of an endangered species on this table right now, and I think that I so love that what our process has is in fishermen involvement. And certainly, you know for me, the GAP, and the SAS, and those are the ones I know the best so I'm not trying to, but they will learn how to get the work done. Fishermen work until the work's done. There's no lunch hour. There's no coffee breaks and it's an eight day a week, 24 hour job sometimes and they'll learn to get it done. So I know we need to save the money and I know can be more efficient, that's for sure, but I just don't want to take the fishermen out of this process because that's near and dear to my heart. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:52] Thank you Butch. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:52] Thank you Chair. When the discussion we were having a few minutes ago about Miss Ames and I about the timing of the briefing book, I'm all for efficiencies and better utilization of Council staff. If the 21 in 14 days works, that's great. That's more time Jessi and Todd and others can be helping herd the cats of the teams. But there's a balance and hopefully 14 days is it with Council members and our public having the time to digest materials. Because I like spreadsheets and things, I was looking some stuff up and one of our recent meetings there was 346 pages of groundfish items alone. That doesn't include any other agenda items, just groundfish items. And I admit, there was a couple of documents I only got through the executive summary of a couple of the documents because in those 14 days, in addition to the Council stuff, I've got to do my regular job, my other part of my job. Let's try this 14 days. If it works, that's great. And if it provides some efficiencies, there's just that trade-off between having the amount of time to digest the materials before we come to the meetings. And as the GMT said, I think all three of the coastal states anyway have delegation meetings that we scheduled beforehand where we have to meet with our constituents. I know oftentimes Washington, California, and Oregon will meet to have some discussions beforehand. So there's just a lot of things in play once that 14 days is in place, but definitely all for better utilization of Council staff time. On the shortening of time of meetings, I think we all have through the Committee-Of-The-Whole and over the last year discussed that that's a place we can get some savings, however, the amount of work, the expectations needs to be commensurate with that decrease. Looking at the June agenda, it's a four-day meeting and there are 10 groundfish items. The GMT is scheduled to meet for four and a half days to cover 10 agenda items. They have a half a day before items start coming up on the floor. Oftentimes, our HMSMT meets for a day and then they have a day or a day and a half with three to five to six agenda items, so if we're decreasing our Council floor time by 20% we can't just expect our advisory bodies to take up, and if we decreasing the amount of time they're meeting as well, we can't expect them to do the same amount of work in less time. We won't get the quality products that we currently get from our management teams and our AS's. That comes from having the time. So we just need to be conscientious. I know September it looks like a five-day meeting and there's only currently eight groundfish items. And I know June will change. I've already heard rumors of a couple of things being taken off of there. But I think both the GAP and the GMT mentioned that as we shorten the amount of days the Council meets, what is expected and the amount of workload that our manage....our teams and our advisory bodies have needs to be commensurate with that which then leads to those big discussions that we do on day last of what don't we do, or what do we prioritize what do we do and what don't we do. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:26] Thank you Lynn. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:12:28] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And appreciate these comments. I just want to make an observation based on something that, well I guess the way that you were describing things Miss Mattes. As Kelly and I and others in our office have started to pull on these threads of saying, okay, let's reduce our Council meeting time, there's a lot of stuff that comes along with that thread, and that's what you're starting to see in this paper that we've put together, which is we shorten up meeting length what does that mean? It means more, well it means that we have to ask each of the advisory bodies to do a little bit less at each meeting because they have to focus. It means we have do more in advance of each meeting to get good materials in advance because we can't ask the GMT to do it all during the meeting, right? So we have come in with more material. So there's a lot of things that come along with what we're trying to do, and I think it is, well this is one of the reasons why we're having this check-in is to say, here's where we're at and these are how all these threads are connected and this is where we are headed. I just want to

make sure that we're all on lockstep about how this works and that's what we are trying to here. So, for what it's worth.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:47] All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:13:51] Thanks Chair. Thanks to the Council staff for putting this together. Do appreciate these updates as we move forward with this and to Kelly and Merrick in particular for thinking through this. Just some notes. I don't think that I have a super strong opinion on the three weeks versus two weeks. And also note that over my tenure coming to this Council meeting, it has changed in terms of the deadlines for the briefing books as was noted. And so I assume if this didn't work we could change it again if that felt right. I can note as someone sitting in an appointed seat, we are in the seat for the whole meeting. It's a lot of materials to get through and having some of those more technical documents that tend to be the first things that are in the briefing books, things provided by the federal and state governments, it is useful to have some extra time to sort of sink your teeth into those, read them and try to understand them, and a lot times that involves phoning a friend to understand the technical nature of some of those documents. And then hearing some of what the AB said and a little bit of where this conversation started, just thinking about that, the ABs in-person versus remote and the timing associated with that, having advisory body meetings remote there's just trade-offs with it, and I think we've already heard some of them. Having them remote can often mean that more people are able to attend because they can call in from wherever they are, whether that's at home or on a boat or traveling or whatnot. That provides better attendance. It's also more transparent the fact that more people can attend. It also means that if they're happening in advance more people can attend because they're not here. And members of the public and such can attend multiple of those because they are not all being held at once, they don't have to be in two rooms at the same time. So just thinking out loud a little bit on what that deadline does if we move that to two weeks, supportive of doing so, just throwing out some considerations.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:05] Thank you Corey. And Rebecca, apologies. I forgot. I had her name down, so please.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:16:09] Thank you very much Mr. Chair, no worries. Like Miss Szumylo I'm new to this. I'm coming in late so forgive me if these ideas are really outrageous. First of all, for the briefing books, is there some reason why you have to have a deadline when you drop all this stuff? Why couldn't you stagger the availability? So starting a month ahead something might be available, put it up there, we'll start reading. Put the next thing. Put the next thing. There must be a reason for that so let me know. Second, for shorter meetings, are there some agenda items that we could do in advance virtually, like the Closed Session or the Budget and Legislative Committees? Those are restricted groups. And as Miss Ridings said, there are some things we could do online and have plenty of people participate who otherwise might not be able to come to the meeting or they're listening to it on YouTube. And the advisory bodies, I would have to say it's one of the greatest pleasant surprises of joining the Council is that these bodies are there. It's almost like they pre-digest this stuff for us. We still need to read it, but I'm with Miss Mattes sometimes, I might read the executive summary maybe because it's technical or I'm just catching up, but it's really lovely to have them. One of the things I notice is that when they do meet outside of the Council, period, I can join them virtually. I can join the virtual meetings. I actually asked my leader here from the state of California if it would be okay for me to leave the table and go to an advisory meeting. She said no, you've got to be in the chair here, so that's one advantage of having it outside.

It is nice when they're here too because you can actually see them. One thing I might suggest, and I suppose this might be heresy for like the legal record for the meeting, but is it possible for their reports....I consider it my responsibility to read those reports as they come out because they're so helpful and so rich, and that's what that means and I read them. So when someone comes and reads them word for word it's not always as effective. This morning we had one report where a person said, look, ours is the same as so-and-so's let me just highlight three things. That was excellent. It was refreshing, easier. I think some of us just tune out when it's..... It's hard, it's not easy to be exciting when you read some of these reports. So just if there's no legal obligation to read it word for word, do that. Also heard this morning a suggestion that for highly technical documents just a half-page executive summary for the layperson would be helpful. Those are just some ideas. And thank you so much for considering these efficiencies. It couldn't have come at a better time to make some progress on these. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:04] Thank you Rebecca. Corey Niles and then Ryan, so Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:19:11] Well, I was actually going to.....thanks Mr. Chair. I was going to say something similar to Rebecca's first comment of the history of the briefing book having one single deadline. They packaged it and Christa's still getting it in the FedEx envelope. But we've heard a lot of, you know the trade-offs involved, but yeah why could there not be multiple deadlines depending on what the meeting was and what the topic was. But I think Lynn hit the nail on the head. The connection to the efficiency is better use of Council staff time. And I think anyone who's ever worked with me on a management team knows we'll push the deadline until the Council discussion happens. So I tend to favor the better information more time than more time to read, but we're all different. So I just, I was going to, just repeating some of the questions Rebecca said, but I think the answer to your question is because it used to be packaged together and sent FedEx.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:13] Thank you Corey. Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:20:13] Yeah, thank you. I support the concepts here and appreciate all the work done by Merrick and Kelly and Council staff on this in outlining these. I do think these are some core areas that we have whittled down to from all of the various meetings and I do think there's some good places to start, not just for cost savings but for efficiencies. On the briefing books, I mean I had some comments and I just realized I probably shouldn't be committing anything on the NMFS side to a briefing book schedule with these current times, but in general I do.....while I support kind of looking at for the 14-day like it's proposed, I do kind of, like the GMT noted, I think there might be some flexibility needed. I think they pointed it out by meeting. I actually think it's more relevant for almost issues or those times where we do have massive technical analyses coming and, or like Lynn was stating, just when you know an agenda item or a Council meeting is going to have significant documents to actually go through, so maybe one size fits all, and I'll take Rebecca's point too on that, also is something that Council could explore. Regarding the informational reports, I fully support that. I think that is a tool that we can continue to use and we have started to expand a little bit. I noted the GAP mentioned using the ability to even put in reports that are for items that are not agendized, and just note that NMFS did that at this meeting with the groundfish stock assessment info report too. So I think that can also be incorporated as a way to get information out in front of the Council without necessarily taking up specific agenda items. And then finally regarding meeting times, I've stated this before under previous agenda items, but obviously this is something where we have been able to find a lot of efficiencies, like the work that Merrick and others have done with agendas going forward so I do support that. I would just



note as I think I said in March, right? The current challenges that NMFS has with participating adequately in meetings that are happening outside normal business hours or business weekdays. Now I recognize that other representatives, either Council members or advisory bodies might have additional challenges, but at least maybe as you're looking forward, and this may be more of a medium term thing with your contracts, I think it'd also be useful to look at whether if we have a meeting that's going to be three days or such, maybe we could look to see if that could be focused during the week as opposed to over a weekend. But I do recognize that that may create other additional challenges for those that are here, both before the meeting starts and after the meeting ends. And I think that sums up my comments on this package. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:35] All right. Thank you Ryan. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:23:35] Thank you Chair. I am, yeah I want to speak for a reason not to have sort of rolling different timelines. And it's an, no we can't say this word, but it's an equity reason. I've had some situations come up where if one constituent shares a piece of information or sets the tone of a conversation with an opinion, it can sway the rest of the comment, comments on that issue or give other people, you know other constituents a chance to prepare differently for how they might address a question. I can think of some examples of situations like that, but I think to have the same deadline for everyone creates the same opportunity to offer information to the discussion and doesn't allow, yeah, undue prep or retort about an issue. So you know I'm fine with deadline shifting, but I do really strongly feel that it has to be the same deadline for everybody.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:42] Thanks Aja. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:24:42] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And somewhat along the line of what Aja just expressed, I mean I certainly can appreciate, you know, the underpinnings of the recommendation for consideration for a different publication deadline that gives staff more time. That, I agree, should be explored. However, I will certainly state that the beauty of the briefing book now, It's a one-stop shop. For our constituents, you know it's a full briefing book for the most part, you know 99.9%. A few informational reports sometimes come in a little later. So they know when they go to it everything is there. I would encourage that if we are going to explore, you know, changing that timeline to give staff more time, that you be able to advise our constituents, you know, this topic is coming. There will be something about this particular topic in the briefing book by X day, so they at least know that it's not complete, that they'll need to come back. You need to give them kind of a roadmap of what's going to be in there and when to come back to help keep that, I think, satisfaction up. So something to think about as you're exploring this.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:12] Thank you Sharon. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Chair. So I guess I will start with willing to try 14 days. I think that that is a pretty big stretch for those of us that have challenges in terms of the briefing book and the volume that is associated with it. I mean, there's a reason why I have a paper copy and it isn't because it's fun. That being said, I think that it is a big ask for members of the public that do have challenges to have the expectation that they are going to read hundreds of pages, if not thousands of pages in less than 14 days. I am going to pivot here for a second on that one because I am appreciative of my colleagues around the table saying, hey, it should be everybody gets to the starting point at the same time in the sense that when some people have longer to prepare than others it is easier for them to have better talking points, shop ideas, do more

outreach, et cetera, so I do think that it is important that whatever we move forward with everybody has the same starting point. In terms of in-person versus online, I think that there are some pretty serious merits to both, but whatever we choose to do I think that we need to be doing the same for all of our advisory bodies that are requesting whatever it is. And I'm not suggesting, like I think the SSC is saying, hey, we only want to do online, it's easier for us. But if there are some groups that only want to meet in-person, I do think we really need to think about that if we move to the online methodology. Having the opportunity to be here for two days, three days, five days, however many days we're here does afford you more access to Council members, all Council members, maybe not just the one or two that happen to be in your region. And I don't think that it is reasonable that some people would have significantly more access and potentially more sway than others based upon a decision like, hey, we're going to do in-person for only some. I do like the mix that we currently have now where we're doing some in-person and some online for all of our advisory bodies. And then the last thing I wanted to just speak briefly about was with regard to my colleague from Oregon's comments around timelines and if we load five agenda items or ten agenda items in, depending on how long your management team or your advisory panel is, that it can be a tremendous amount of workload and that we likely, especially if we cut our meetings down, will have a shorter amount of time to prepare on all of our agenda items. And I agree that we probably will not get the same quality. I think we need to be very clear also with our management teams and advisory bodies if we do proceed on that path, that we don't expect the same quality, because otherwise it's a recipe for burnout of people trying to deliver what they've been doing without the resources that they've had, which we're limited to begin with. And to just provide a little insight on that one, you know we made the decision this last year to cut the staff officer for international management, which has put the reporting on myself. I've always given an oral report. I will continue to give an oral report, but the quality of the reporting to the Council for international activities is less than it was when we did have staff officers that were attending and participating. I'm not suggesting that we go back to the old method, but I am saying that when we made that decision we set the expectation that it would not be at the same level, and I think if we're going move forward on these that we do need to set that expectation with our advisory bodies and management teams as well so that they're not putting themselves in situations where we end up losing the talent completely because they burn out and decide they would rather go elsewhere.

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

**Corey Niles** [00:05:09] Well I could sit here and debate this deadline issue forever, but I think I was going to move on to another.....well, I think that...I don't like a one size, I don't think it's an either-or and I don't think a deadline should be, it doesn't, a one size fit all does not answer tradeoffs for issues where the tradeoffs are, they differ issue by issue. And it's the end point that I have in mind, not the starting point. And it's us from this perspective, at least I know all of us are listening to the very end before we have to make a decision on what we hear in public testimony, what others hear around the table, so to ignore information because we didn't make a deadline, there's nothing that gets me more than that. But also I'll see if Butch had a.....wanted to stick that issue and I just had a comment about the informational report and the Enforcement Consultants to make later.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:12] Thank you Corey. Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:06:17] Yeah, just for the record, whatever the Enforcement Consultants want to do is fine with me.....(laughter).....But anyway, I started on a project that I brought to Merrick's attention a few years ago and then he brought a panel above. And I like sausage but I don't

necessarily know what goes into it but I know it's good when it comes out the other end, and probably wouldn't want to know what went into it in some parts. But it brings me to the ask, do we really need 300 and 400-page documents and how much time that takes? And I'm sure we need them somewhere so somebody could look at all the detailed nuclear science that goes into making those documents, but in those documents we've cut out a pretty good section of our consumers that have no idea what they say. And I still, before I take off this suit and burn it whenever that might be, would like to be able to myself read a good groundfish document in some eighth or ninth or even sophomore college English and be able interpret it. And when we had that little discussion with I think the SCC, I really got a lot of good comments, and from that group on doing something like that. And maybe that might save time that we work towards simplifying some of those documents. I think executive summary or whatever I've heard it around the table, I've heard you know, and so maybe eventually how we do business, you know, and get it to our consumers, our constituents change a little bit too so they can understand them. And I know they hire some people, some groups hire some pretty educated people way beyond the Ilwaco University degree I have that can't discern some of those documents and, you know I think we should listen to what they have said and maybe work towards that. So that's just a pitch for my....and this might be the right timing for that as we improve things and streamline things and make things, for a better word, more better. I know that's a horrible way to say things, but anyway I appreciate it. And thank you Christa for your comments. And I think you do a dandy job on your report, so just for the record. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:11] All right, thank you Butch. David Sones and then Gorelnik.

**David Sones** [00:09:17] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I'd like to comment also on, I really would oppose remote AB and the management teams doing their business that way. Just the experience of, even though I wasn't on the Council, I listened in on a lot of what was going on during the COVID cases, COVID times, and things got really ugly, you know, talking to each other online. There's just something about our people sitting down in a room and working things out. It just face-to-face has to be. You just get more aggressive, less considerate I think when you're talking to a screen than when you are talking to somebody's face. There's also a lot of interaction between the ABs and the MTs where they're meeting and talking with each other or asking questions from the advisory bodies to those management teams that, you know, it can happen directly or with a little group, but you don't have to try and figure it out online. I just think that would really be a bad idea. If our people....and you got to walk into one of these tribal meetings and just the tension in there is unreal, but it would be a lot worse if they weren't able to sit down face to face and work through everything. You know there's even a lot of contentions within, say, the SAS. I know they've been struggling with some stuff this week. And if you're not there in the room with each other you're just not going to get it worked out. It's just too easy to walk away when you're not sitting down or you can't go out and have dinner. You know, when I was on the Council before and I had Sandy Zeiner was my staffer. She was almost social, also my social director and she had me out to dinner with all the Council people, all the people in all these management teams and ABs just to sit and have dinner and talk and get to know each other and become a family. I think you'll lose that family if you go to remote ways of doing business, it's just not the same. And also I agree with Butch on these documents that we're policy people here. I'm feeling like I have to be a scientist now in order to understand what is going on around the table. We have people that do that for us. We're policy makers and our decisions should be made in a policy light, and having to go through 10,000 pounds of documents that I, you know half the time I don't understand. But I understand a lot more than our people, a lot of our people do, because I

did manage fisheries for 25 years and do understand a lot of this stuff. I'm not a biologist but a policy person then. But it's hard for me to get through that stuff too, and so I think we could lighten the load a little and get it more in layman's terms so people can understand how to work their way through these documents and comment on it. For me the most important thing though is I think that we've got to keep the face-to-face meetings in place because it just keeps us together as a family. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:55] Thank you Dave. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:12:56] Yeah, let me start by endorsing David Sones comments. It may not be true for every meeting or every advisory group every time, but I know you're familiar with salmon, I'm familiar with salmon, and that's an iterative process where there's continual interaction during a Council meeting with the advisory bodies, and I think we recognize the need to have that process in person. You know and that same is true for the north of Falcon process, which is an iterative process. And I also want to endorse the notion that when things get posted to the briefing book, the authors need to be aware of the audience of the briefing book. And the audience isn't someone in the next Carol, another scientist, the audience is the Council and the stakeholders. The topic here though is Council efficiencies and that has arisen out of, you know, obviously significant budget challenges that the Council faces which may be getting exacerbated. And so when I look at the various suggestions here and recommendations, I think to myself, what is this going to do to ease the financial burden? And certainly shortening meetings is something because you save on hotel, per diem, Council member compensation, et cetera. I'm not sure in my own mind what altering the briefing book production time does to save the Council money. There may be some efficiencies within staff operations, but we have the same staff and obviously shortening the production time is going to create some difficulties on one end or the other. And so I guess I just, I don't....I understand that maybe it's a potential efficiency for staff. I'm not sure that that's an economic efficiency. And I guess to the same extent, I'll comment on the suggestion that perhaps we can engage with remote printing. I'm not sure how that is a financial efficiency when FedEx takes a day to deliver it and we have printers in the Council office. north of Falcon is a challenge for us as a Council because it's a process we have to accommodate in order to do our business here and it takes time. And you know what, honestly, it isn't always north of the Falcon that takes a lot of time, sometimes south of Falcon takes time too. But I don't want to see those salmon considerations shortchange other FMPs and other stakeholders by forcing us to shorten other meetings simply because we can't shorten March and April. I don't think it's fair to the other stakeholders. I don't think it is fair to all the other folks in the Council process. So I understand the need to shorten Council meetings and I think we've made a lot of progress in that already. The need to have some advisory body meetings remote and we've done a lot of that already. And maybe there is a way for us to be more efficient with salmon. Maybe there's a way, you know, I think we need to consult with the north of Falcon people and say, is there anything we can do or you can do to help us save some time? But whatever that answer is, I don't want to see that shortchanging other parts of the Council process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:56] All right, thank you Marc. All right, well Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:17:03] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah I had that one last thought on the informational report question. Yeah, I think Dave, you said it wonderfully about the remote and what happened in the pandemic, agree. And Marc, yeah I think the efficiency connection is all, again, I'll use the word trade-offs, there are trade-offs with everything. So I was thinking about the trade-offs with

informational reports and I was thinking something similar of the value of being in-person of the Coast Guard Report we get every year came to mind, and so would we lose something if we didn't have that interaction with the Rear Admiral and staff? And my thought was yes, we would lose that interaction. So I think it might be a case by case thinking about the trade-offs, but a long way of saying I liked what the Enforcement Consultants had that thought before, before seeing their suggestion of there's a middle ground and I just wanted to call that out. And I think there will be some issues where when we're doing meeting planning we should debate whether, or you know make recommendations to staff on whether something could be informational or need its own agenda item, even if the purpose of the agenda item is mainly informational and not decisional.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:38] Okay, thanks Corey. Okay, well Kelly we've had a pretty good airing here.

**Kelly Ames** [00:18:51] Yes, thank you. I really appreciate the robust discussion around the staff proposals and our steps that we have taken to kind of move towards your recommendations from June 2024. I've taken some good notes. I will not summarize them here today in the essence of efficiency, but really do appreciate, you know, it is hard to change the way that we have done business for quite some time. And so these discussions and these ongoing updates kind of help us reframe our thinking, think of other options to implement, to meet your recommended goals. So I feel that I have what I need from this discussion, but I would like to look over to Executive Director Burden just to see if he has any other things he'd like to tease out from this discussion before we move on.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:50] All right. Executive Director of Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:19:52] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And I'll also express my appreciation for this very healthy discussion. Kelly and I are planning to just ensure that we're in lockstep as we continue going forward, so we'll have another conversation along these lines later this year. And I think as you'll see, that as we go through the effort of implementing what you directed us to do last year, that like I was saying to Miss Mattes earlier, when we pull one thread a lot of things come with it, so we'll be describing to you how all of these things fit together and it might take some more discussion as we do that. So just appreciate all of your attentiveness to this and your openness to doing things differently and we'll get there. I'm confident we'll get there. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:42] All right, well very good. So that takes care of C.5 and we have a four o'clock with salmon, right? So I guess we'll see everybody back here at four? And yes, we can get out of these suits and more comfortable clothes for everybody and we'll go from there at four o'clock it sounds so, all right? Dave.

**David Sones** [00:21:11] I just wanted to say before we left this agenda item, one thing I used to always brag about when Don MacIsaac was there is I believe this is the best Council out of all the Councils. I'm a little biased but you know we have done all this stuff very efficiently. I think the way we've structured and moved everything very methodical and careful about what we do, so I'm a little uncomfortable with, like, why are we having to fix so many things we worked so hard to achieve through efficiencies? And clear back to the days when, you know, we managed rockfish as red rock, brown rock, black rock, and that was all we had. Now we got 70-some different species that we manage. That takes time and it's important that we go through all these species and understand our impacts on them because we did drive them into the ground. And right about the

time our people were about ready to go fishing everything got wiped out, canaries gone, yellowtails messed up, I mean it was just a mess. And so we did move into this big, you know huge effort to understand all those species and how we interact with them and how they interact with each other, and it's very well thought out. And so we should give ourselves credit for really doing a good job over the last 20 years. But I wanted to get that in there before we left the agenda.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:49] Thank you David. All right. Okay, we'll see everybody here at four o'clock.

## **D. Salmon Management**

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

## 2. Tentative Adoption of 2025 Management Measures for Analysis

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That will complete our reports and the public comment and takes us to our Council action. In a few seconds that'll be.... ..there it is on us on the screen to adopt Tentative 2025 Ocean Salmon Management Measures for Analysis. I'm going to look around and see, anybody wants to initiate the discussion based on what we've heard here today before we get to any motions? Unless you want to go straight to that. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:00:42] Thank you. I make up for all my silence during groundfish items on salmon agenda items. One concern I have, and I want to make sure we arrive at the most accurate result we can when it comes to impacts on our beleaguered Klamath stock. We have a budget, if you will, in the ocean fishery for spawners, basically the spawner reduction rate. And I know that this season that the SAS worked hard to put together is intended to contact a certain number of ocean Klamath fish, but as we heard from Dr. O'Farrell not all of those are spawners. So what I'd like to know if we have a certain budget for a spawner reduction in that ocean fishery? I'd like to know what that means in terms of ocean impacts because we may not be designing a season around the correct number of ocean impacts. And so I don't want to include that in a motion or anything, it's basically a request of the STT to provide that information as we go through the week. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:27] All right, thank you. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:02:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess I'd like to go back to Kevin Godes's testimony and his description of the desire with regard to a small target fishery at Pillar Point and how that reconciles with the SAS proposal, and I guess I would just note that based on his answer, my understanding is that fishery would be approved for the dates that currently are reflected in the SAS recommendation. If additional days for fishing were desired, those dates would need to be added for...if fishing were to be considered in that area for any longer time period. So I just want to make sure that the expectations are clear that we couldn't go and add days in a fall fishery just at Pillar Point after the fact. So I want to just make sure that there's broad understanding of that at this time. I guess another thing I'd like to get into, which we'll hear about a little bit more later when I think we get into motions, but the situation with the Sacramento River fishery. The 3 alternatives that were out for public review had different levels of river harvest between Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. And so at this time we'd like to offer that the river fishery be set at a projected impact level of 8,000 adults. The range of alternatives that were put out for public review had at the lower end about 6,500 fish up to a high end of 21,600. After having an opportunity to consult further with our inland fishery managers about what we might project could be harvested in a river fishery, that of course is subject to the Fish and Game Commission's decision-making, and this fishery would be at their discretion, but what would we project could be taken in a fishery, that is the estimate that we've come together with acknowledging that Sacramento fall run is at low abundance this year, and recognizing that there are some stocks in the complex, particularly the Mokelumne fish, that are abundant, but then there are also some weak stocks too, for example, some of those in the upper Sacramento where we've seen really poor escapement year over year. So the department's working on developing those recommendations to the Fish and Game Commission regarding open areas and season dates. Those are still in development, but recognizing that in order for our modeling work to proceed here this week we needed to provide a projection of what the expected Sac fall harvest might be in the river fishery.



That's the best estimate that we can come up with at this time. So I just wanted to provide that explanation now because you might see that come up later in this discussion. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:46] All right, thank you Marci. And I think you led that off with a question and it appears Mr. Gorelnik has a response.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:06:53] Yeah, I think in so far as this harbor target zone fishery, I think we need to discuss this offline. The notion here, it's not really limited to this year, although this year is, you know, we're going to have perhaps, if you know, we'll see on day last whether we have this fall area zone from Point Reyes to Point Sur and that obviously addresses to a large extent, it's a limited number of days. Obviously it doesn't happen in November. It's not in our proposal and there's a biological opinion that would prevent those large areas from being fished in November, however in the harbor is full of salmon in November. So this is not....the notion is...this isn't a, this is something that I think folks would anticipate being a state managed fishery not a Council managed fishery, but we need to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service on this obviously to....and whether it happens this year or in the future, you know I think that those fish that are paid for by the commercial trollers and by recreational fishermen and are put out there by volunteers, I think it's better that those folks get access to those fish rather than the sea lions.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:17] Thank you. Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:08:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just following-up on that and my tradition of being a broken record on some issues. You know there are other stocks that sometimes, depending on the shape and the size and the timing of that fishery can get impacted also, so not to forget, for example, our coastal coho that are out in that area sometimes, some areas and times of the year more than others, later in particular. So just a reminder and a request that you....that that be taken into account as I know there are lots of discussions that are still occurring, it's early in the week. And I don't know if it's an affirmation or again a reminder that all of the impacts need to be modeled in all of those fisheries state waters or ocean just to make sure that we meet our objectives for the exploitation rates and the escapements that we have. So I know this is nothing that you all don't know but I sort of felt like I wanted to get it on the record and that also gives the STT an option to, you know, at least let us know if there are any concerns with the proposals.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:30] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any discussion. Maybe it's time to hear some motions and rather than trying to get it out, maybe if I start on my left and work around the room, that's also going somewhat north to south. So Kyle Adicks, do you have anything?

**Kyle Adicks** [00:09:59] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion for the Council. I move to tentatively adopt the Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures for Non-Indian Fisheries in the area between the U.S.-Canada border and Cape Falcon as presented in Agenda Item D.2.e, Supplemental SAS Report 1, dated April 10, 2025 for STT coalition and analysis with the following modifications. For the area north of Cape Falcon: Set the overall non-Indian TAC to 115,000 Chinook and 108,000 marked coho. Adjust the identified trade to: Commercial troll traded 5,000 marked coho to the recreational fishery for 1,250 Chinook. Chinook traded moved from the Area 1 recreational to the July through September commercial troll fishery. Coho traded moved from the commercial troll fishing to the Columbia River Subarea recreational fishery. Set the pre-trade non-Indian commercial TAC to 59,000 Chinook and 17,280 marked coho. Resulting TAC

post-trade of 60,250 Chinook and 12,280 marked coho. Set the May-June Chinook limit to 37,800 and the July to September Chinook limit to 22,450. Set subarea catch limits for the May-June fishery consistent with the methods used for calculating those caps in all 3 alternatives from Pre-season Report 2, Agenda item D.2, Supplemental Attachment 3. And for the U.S.-Canada border to Queets River, that is no more than 10,000 Chinook. And for Leadbetter Point to Cape Falcon, no more than 6,640 Chinook. Set the pre-trade recreational TAC to 56,000 Chinook and 90,720 marked coho. Resulting TAC post-trade of 54,750 Chinook and 95,720 marked coho. For the Neah Bay Subarea: That's a marked coho quota of 9,430 and a Chinook guideline of 13,600. For the La Push Subarea: A marked coho quota of 2,360 and a Chinook guideline of 2,280. For the Westport Subarea: A marked coho quota of 33,570 and a Chinook guideline of 22,720. And for the Columbia River Subarea: A marked coho quota of 50,360 and a Chinook guideline of 16,150.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:31] Thank you. I followed along. The language on the screen appeared accurate and complete. Do you agree?

**Kyle Adicks** [00:12:36] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:37] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:12:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And thanks to the SAS and STT for their patience as we moved through some co-manager meetings last evening and then to this morning, missing the deadline for the report for today's agenda item and to the SAS for bringing forward the north of Falcon regulation package with the placeholders for quota levels and related subarea caps, guidelines and quotas. The Chinook quota identified here is slightly above the Alternative 2 quota of 112,500, but management measures are slightly different than what was in that alternative and should hold impacts on listed Puget Sound stocks to levels from Alternative 2 and consistent with NOAA guidance on impact of Council fisheries on these stocks, and should also limit impacts on upper Columbia summer Chinook to levels similar to Alternative 2. The coho quota identified is slightly below the Alternative 2 quota of 115,000 and should better position us to meet management objectives for coastal Washington coho stocks. The trade identified has the support of commercial and recreational SAS representatives. The coho quotas were attained quickly in recreational fisheries last year and have a good likelihood to do so again this year. The trade will better enable both sectors to achieve fishery objectives identified in the FMP by improving the duration of the recreational fishery in the Columbia River area and improving economic value and duration of the commercial troll fishery. It will also lower impacts on coastal Washington coho stocks and contribute to meeting their management objectives. I included the pre and post-trade TAC values in the motion for clarity, but anticipate that the post-trade values will be displayed in the next STT Report on the fishing package. The pre-trade recreational fishery subarea guidelines and quotas were calculated consistent with FMP allocations and methods used in all alternatives adopted in March, then were adjusted to reflect the identified trade. There's still a placeholder value for catch in the buoy 10 sport fishery at the mouth of the Columbia. That will be, there'll be an inriver model run for that fishery this evening and it can be updated in the next STT Report. We know we'll have additional work to do in the north of Cape Falcon forum in the coming days to ensure that the combined Council area and inside fisheries will achieve conservation objectives for all Chinook and coho stocks prior to final action next week. It's not at all uncommon to have a number of Puget Sound stocks that are not meeting objectives when this initial package is modeled at this point in the process. And finally, thanks again to the SAS for all their work to bring this

forward, to the STT for all the work they've done over the past months and will be doing over the next week. It's good to have that team back in full in-person here this week. I know they had a challenging week in March so nice to see them all here and able to go full speed for us.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:22] All right, thank you Kyle. Any questions for clarification on the motion? No questions. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:15:40] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:42] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Kyle. John North, anything from Oregon?

**John North** [00:15:57] Yeah, yes sir Vice-Chair. I think I should have a motion in play here. Thank you. In terms of Agenda Item D.2, the ODFW motion for today is I move to tentatively adopt for the Salmon Technical Team coalition and analysis the Ocean Salmon Fishery Management Measures for fisheries in the area between Cape Falcon, Oregon, and the Oregon-California border as presented in Agenda Item D.2.e, Supplemental SAS Report 1, dated April 10, 2025.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:36] Thank you. The language on the screen all looks accurate and complete. Is that good?

**John North** [00:16:41] It does.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:41] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Chair Pettinger. Please speak to your motion.

**John North** [00:16:52] Thank you. Yeah, I guess I just primarily today wanted to thank the Oregon SAS members for working together to develop this revised Oregon alternative to help address the public comments we received at the Oregon public salmon hearing and those comments that were submitted online that requested more or additional Chinook recreational opportunity in the June and July or summertime compared to what we had in the March alternatives, and I think this proposal, this alternative today, you know, which has reduced June troll time and increased recreational Chinook time, is a good example of how the different user groups can work together to address each other's needs. And overall I think it's a better alternative and provides a good starting point for continued work the rest of this week.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:02] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? No questions. Discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:18:11] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Consistent with my remarks at the March meeting, I will not be supporting this motion. The Oregon proposed season structure meets the requirements and objectives that are specified and also meet the sharing arrangements, I'd note that too, however that doesn't make the proposed seasons risk averse. The NMFS guidance indicates a precautionary approach on Klamath fall is warranted, and opening fisheries with no safeguards does not seem precautionary. Klamath fall is a stock that's in terrible shape. It's overfished. We've got a very small allowable exploitation rate and we need to be risk averse. We know the harvest models are projecting low harvest in response to the low forecast of abundance. Given that, we

should proceed with caution. And in this instance we were hoping to see perhaps in April Oregon come back with some restraint on these open periods that would limit their harvest. I realize that their projected harvests are within the impacts, but again, it's our belief that these proposals are not risk averse. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:48] Other discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:19:59] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:01] Opposed?

**Council** [00:20:03] No.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:06] And let me make.....well, let me finish the vote first. Abstentions? So I believe there were no votes from Marci Yaremko, Marc Gorelnik, Corey Ridings. Were there others? Rebecca Lent. Okay, four no votes. I believe the motion passes, confirmed by the Executive Director. Thank you John. Anything else you have?

**John North** [00:20:39] Not right now. Thank you Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:41] All right, thank you. Then I will turn to my right. Marci Yaremko. California.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:20:50] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I move to tentatively adopt for STT coalition and analysis the Salmon Management Measures for the 2025 Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Ocean Fisheries in the area from the Oregon-California border to the U.S.-Mexico border as presented in Agenda Item D.2.e, Supplemental SAS Report 1, dated April 10th, 2025, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions, and exceptions with direction to set the Sacramento River recreational fishery impacts at 8,000 Sacramento River fall Chinook.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:33] Thank you Marci. I followed along. That language all looks accurate and complete, is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:21:38] Yes, it is correct.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:39] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:21:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just want to acknowledge the work that has taken place since the March meeting, including the efforts of Council staff to offer us a very nice hearing opportunity, and then also the public comment portal acknowledging that we've received over 300 comments on this topic. It certainly allowed all of us, including our SAS reps, to receive a wide array of input, which we did. I want to thank the SAS for thinking long and hard about both the risks and the benefits of fishery opportunities this season. We didn't have a discussion with George when he was up here presenting the SAS alternatives, but I just want to acknowledge the difficult decision that the commercial sector has come to for the pre-September

fishery, not moving forward with any fishing opportunity for the commercial fishery pre-September in this initial draft of the alternatives and the challenge that they were faced weighing those costs and benefits. So we didn't have a discussion earlier today about that recommendation from George but I just want to note it. Then I also want to look toward our recreational representatives and the discussion that we did have on the floor about their very cautious approach to what very well likely will be derby openers in a recreational fishery and what can we do to make sure that we take every step possible to ensure that we do not blow through the harvest guidelines that have been developed. Of course the ultimate need here is to stay within the projected impacts, and so I just want to commend them for doing their own kind of back of the envelope math and thinking about, you know again, that the models that we're working with in light of the very low abundance are projecting we're not going to catch very much. But they've gone the extra mile to really think about what the models are suggesting and perhaps applying, you know, some needed extra caution there with the approach to eliminate two of the four days in June and July that they were initially contemplating. So they have done a lot of homework and thought about how to be risk averse, and I just want to commend them for their discussions and their initial decision-making here this week. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:02] Thank you Marci. Questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? And with no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:25:23] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:23] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Again, thank you Marci. David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:25:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I should have a motion that'll come up here. Okay, I move the Council adopt for the STT analysis the following Treaty Troll Salmon Management Measures. The Makah Option is 45,000 Chinook and 40,000 coho. The alternative consists of a May 1 through June 30th Chinook-directed fishery and a July through September 30th all-species fishery. The Chinook quota will be evenly split between the two time periods. The QTA Option would be 40,000 Chinook and 35,000 coho. The alternative consists of May 1 through June 30th for Chinook-directed fishery and a July 1 through September 15th all-species fishery. The Chinook quota would be evenly split between the two time periods.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:35] Thank you. I followed along. That all looks accurate and complete on the screen. Do you agree?

**David Sones** [00:26:41] I do.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:41] Good, is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Kyle Adicks. Please speak to your motion.

**David Sones** [00:26:48] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Not a lot to say, but this is a little different than we've approached our options in the past other than I think last year, but we'd like to see what the analysis of the two options are. I'm not sure where we're at with Thompson Coho. I know there's probably a lot of shaping still in the interior fisheries having such huge pink runs this year.

I they're kind of struggling to plug all of fisheries in and try to meet those objectives for Thompson Coho.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:27] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? No questions. Discussion on the motion? No questions, I'll call the question. Those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:27:43] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:43] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. So with those steps I'm going to give people a chance to say anything else they need to, but while you're thinking about that, Angela is there anything else we need to do?

**Angela Forristall** [00:28:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, there's nothing else you need to do under this agenda item. You heard a number of reports from various management entities and advisory bodies. You received a motion from each state and the tribes. And so the next steps would be for the STT to take that information, start running their models, and report back to the Council tomorrow.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:31] All right, thank you. Any last words needed here before I pass the gavel back? Not seeing any hands I'll send the gavel back to our Chair.

### 3. Clarify Council Direction on 2025 Management Measures

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That will complete our reports, public comment, and take us to Council discussion. Provide any available needed guidance at this time for STT and its analysis. I'll look around and see if anyone has anything to say. Nothing? So I'm taking it that we have no additional guidance to provide at this time. So for this agenda item what we would do is hold it open. I know we got our.....made our motion late yesterday. It was a lot of work for the STT and they were still reviewing it and people are looking at this. So what we will do is keep this agenda item open and come back to D.3 sometime this afternoon. Stay tuned. We'll update you as we know when the right time is and complete our work under D.3.....(BREAK).....And it looks like we're ready so we don't need the big overview, but I'm going to ask Angela just refresh us on where we should start here.

**Angela Forristall** [00:01:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This is coming back for the second half of salmon Agenda Item D.3, Clarify Council Direction. This morning you did receive an update from Dr. O'Farrell about the model run outputs. And so coming back to get any additional guidance from the Council that you may have at this time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:52] All right, thank you. With that I'll look around and see if there's any guidance following up discussions that have occurred. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:02:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I don't have any guidance for Council area fisheries. We will have some changes to inside fisheries for Washington that will affect our progress towards making conservation objectives, but nothing for Council area fisheries at this time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:19] All right, thank you for that. Let me just go down the coast then. John, do you have anything?

**John North** [00:02:27] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We have a little bit of guidance. If we could get that pulled up on the screen. This is some regulatory reporting language that was requested by enforcement. So for ODFW salmon management guidance today in Agenda Item D.3.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 12th. Under Table 1, ODFW Commercial Management Alternatives beginning on page 2, Cape Falcon to Heceta Bank line, please add the text, "all fishers landing Chinook salmon south of the Heceta Bank line are required to notify ODFW within 1 hour of delivery or prior to transport away from the port of landing by either calling the number noted or sending notification via email to the address noted. Notification shall include vessel name and number, number of Chinook salmon, port of landing, and location of delivery and estimated time of delivery".

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:38] All right. Thank you. Is that it? Is there any more there?

**John North** [00:03:41] That's it for today. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:43] Okay. Good. All right, Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:48] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do you have one piece of guidance. Great, thank you. So referring to Agenda Item D.3.a, Supplemental STT report 1, dated April 12,

2025, implement the following changes, and this is in Table 5. Under projected key stock escapements or management criteria for 2025 ocean fishery alternatives, the Klamath River recreational fishery share, the table begins on Page 16. The guidance is to adjust the Klamath River recreational fishery share such that the projected natural-area adult spawner escapement equals 19,417.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:49] All right, thank you Marci. And that completes it? That's it?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:04:55] Yes, if I could just speak to it for a second?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:57] Sure.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:04:57] Yeah, the need here, looking at Table 5 and the line item for Klamath River fall, our new adjusted 2025 minimum natural-area adult spawner escapement per the FMP Control Rule is that number of 19,417. So that's under the max allowed exploitation rate of 10%. By adjusting the river fishery share to that number, it allows the 50-50 sharing for our inriver tribal fisheries to maximize their opportunity under that allowable 10% FMP Control Rule exploitation rate. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:49] All right, thank you. And with that, David Sones?

**David Sones** [00:05:54] No further guidance at this time. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:58] All right. Thank you. Then I believe unless anybody has any other comments or discussion here that would complete this, but I will look back to Angela to confirm that.

**Angela Forristall** [00:06:16] Yes, your work on Agenda Item D.3 is now complete and the STT will come back and report to you all again tomorrow.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:25] All right, thank you. Then that closes out D.3.



#### 4. Methodology Review Preliminary Topic Selection

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] We've completed all our reports, public comment on D.4, The Methodology Review. Maybe if we can splash up on the screen, as people are getting to raise their hand, what our task is before us. And there it is, providing guidance to the SSC and STT regarding potential topics and priorities and relevant agencies to develop and provide needed materials. And remember our final decision on items that will undergo the methodology review occurs in September. So with that, let me look around and see who wants to initiate the discussion. We've had a fair amount of discussion amongst the various presentations. I keep looking left and right. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:01:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. One of the recurring themes through the reports today was about the OPIH forecast methodology. The Council recalls in March, WDFW and ODFW brought a joint report that had a modification to the existing methodology that was this 25% exponential-decay approach, and I believe the end of that statement recommended some further investigation for beyond 2025 through methodology review. I think that's a good idea. There's some other topics that have come up. The SSC Report mentioned digging a little deeper into breaking the forecast out into components, that sort of thing. I'm supportive of that work, I'm just not sure how much staff time the OPITT group will have to dedicate to that this summer. They've got another very big task they're involved in with renegotiation of the U.S. v. Oregon Agreement, which is a 10 year, very important agreement. So I just don't know how much staff time people will have the throw at that. So I am committed to helping coordinate and see what we can get done in time for this year's methodology review. We've got a lot of the work done on this exponential-decay rate. A lot quick exploratory work was done to get to that. Just don't know how much more time we'll have to get to something beyond that on this cycle.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:39] All right, thank you. John North.

**John North** [00:02:41] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. With respect to the OPIH forecast methodology topic that was recommended by the SSC, STT, and mentioned by the SAS, back in March I obviously supported that revised methodology for applying the exponential-decay-weighting approach and I continue to support that going forward. Based on the analysis that was provided back in March that appears to be an improved method which reduced percent absolute error and I view it as a more adaptable framework moving forward and ability to adjust to changing conditions. And also key is allow the modeler some flexibility. I think they're, I think they're getting into some really encouraging areas here with this kind of a model approach. So I would support to see that moving forward for methodology review and include any other potential improvements to the forecast methodology that might be identified through that process. In terms of the other potential topics, I guess I'd be supportive of what the STT laid out in their report, including the derivate, I can't even say that word, derivation of natural area SMSY for Sacramento River fall Chinook by the Sacramento Work Group. And evaluating methods for deriving a total natural and hatchery escapement objective based on consideration of natural production and hatchery needs. It does seem that there's so many moving parts right now with the Sacramento fall Chinook. It is a bit hard to follow. I do seem to keep going back to the STT statement from last September where they concluded the assessment and management landscape for Sacramento fall Chinook may become more clearly defined moving forward. And the potential changes for Sacramento fall Chinook related to uncertainty for the abundance forecast and bias correction and

buffers may be better reviewed at a later methodology review. And I think it's connected to Council that's shown interest in the development of the risk tables, which seems, you know, a strong parallel. So for those reasons I'd support moving forward with one and three, Numbers 1 and 3. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:22] Thank you John. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:05:27] Thanks Vice. Thanks Mr. Adicks and Mr. North for those opening comments. I just want to talk a little bit about the OPIH review. I did not vote for this in March because I felt that it had not gone through proper methodology review. And my concerns that I had then I feel were very reflected on the floor this morning actually, when we've been talking about making sure that when we are looking at new methods and we're looking at new science, that it is transparent, that this Council has had a chance to look at it, that our public advisors have had a change to look at it, and that there has been an open and rigorous review of the science and the scientific process. At this point, I would like to see that move forward with the review, but I would like to it move forward with the recommendations that the SSC made, which involved doing a review including the key component stocks. So I think perhaps I'm disagreeing with Mr. Adicks a tad by just saying that if that moves forward, I would like it to move forward with those key component stocks as part of that method's review.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:40] All right, thank you. Other discussion? Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:06:47] So just backing up a little bit, I very much appreciated all of the reports and the testimony this morning. That kind of helped me get a bigger picture of common themes and kind of directions that people would like to see. So I just wrote down a few bullet points on what I think I had heard. There wasn't just one point expressed, but basically sort of heard it from various different parties and that that might also could help focus some of the conversation going forward, particularly around the Sacramento topics. First, I heard a lot of support for the work group and that the work that they, work that the work groups doing is really important, which was good to hear verification of that, but that there was a desire to really focus on the core components that we need for management to do that, and that that might require a little bit more guidance from the Council in terms of prioritizing the tasks and the TORs. And I think that gets to the tasks that were suggested today or the topics that were suggested today for management or methodology review related to the work group. So of the three, what we heard from the STT was, for example, that the second topic had merit but maybe the sequencing was an issue. Maybe not right now, so we have it on the list and we decide when the appropriate time for that to come in is. I heard a desire for more updates and transparency, so that might be slowing things down a little bit or at least more check-ins on reports from the work group, which I think is helpful. I mean, we want people to understand the work that the work group is doing in a relatable way how we got there and where it's going. And also, I think I just spoke to this, which is a consideration of sequencing of the various points. We don't have, several folks have talked about this, not only the advisory bodies, but also NOAA itself, and I think John brought it up and Kyle as well, we have a lot of work that we're putting on fewer and fewer people, so we want to make sure that we are front-loading the things that are most important. And that people really want to see a full package before any final decision is made on the management approach. So there's a lot of moving pieces here. There's a lot of questions about how they all fit together. There are some of the issues that Mr. Gorelnik raised in his presentation this morning of maybe we need to talk a little bit about which part of the data series that we use, that may be something the Council wants to consider. And so

it's going to be helpful to see these things all put together. It's important for, just my last point here is, it's important for the work group to know that the foundational pieces that they're using are solid science, but we want to make sure that we understand how all those pieces fit together before we make a final decision, and that's a little different than something we talk about, but that also allows the work group the opportunity, the flexibility as it moves through and starts putting all these things together, that if there's something that doesn't quite fit or if there is a conversation that comes up along the way that says, hey, maybe this is a better way to do it, they can fit that into the approach and then bring the full thing back for the Council without feeling like they're locked into it. And I think, I can't remember if it was Mr. North or Mr. Adicks, referred to that with regard to the OPIH topic, that the work group felt like they didn't have the flexibility to do some of the tweaking that would have been really helpful to do this year. So I just sort of lay those thoughts out for the Council membership as maybe to help further the conversation.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:36] Thank you Susan. Marci. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:10:45] Excuse me, yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I want to echo the comments both from Mr. North and from Miss Bishop. And I have given this some thought and maybe have an idea on how we synthesize this all together, acknowledging I think this greater need for a more clear process and sequencing of the next steps. I don't think we've put a lot of thought into that here and now, but I think that's certainly something that our Council staff can think about with regard to our plans for Year-At-a-Glance, our plans for receipt of upcoming reports from the work group. So I think maybe we might want to task Council staff with bringing back that sequencing in that plan here and now. Also been thinking a lot about the discussions around the table, and particularly from the SAS and our public comments, about the need to restructure the approach somewhat and address both policy and technical needs, and I think maybe the way we do that is through this sequenced approach and so that there is more transparency. I appreciate the testimony that George offered on behalf of the SAS. They've done their best to follow along in some very deep, detailed discussions. I have too. I've attempted to attend as many of these meetings as I can and they are very dense. That's a great characterization. It's also difficult because we don't have materials in front of us. We have a paragraph. I realize that the Munsch paper has been out in circulation and available for review, but what we're talking about here is an application of that approach that has yet to be seen by anyone. I know there was a slide deck prepared for the January work group meeting, but it's not something that's available in our materials. So I do appreciate the discussion that I had with Dr. Satterthwaite on the fact that the materials that would come forward for methods review would include an analysis of those other approaches and also an assessment of why the preferred approach is in fact the preferred. I think that's really important for everyone to get in and understand and look at alternatives. I also really want to acknowledge the thinking of the SAS with the need for this comprehensive package, which they're thinking back to our last methods review process where we did adopt, I'm not going to say hastily, but as an outcome of methods review we did approve the new method for determining a maximum allowable exploitation rate, and I know some folks were actually caught by surprise. We did, in that discussion around the table, find a path forward and in fact decided that we'd re-review that max ER by 2028. So it was kind of a temporary decision. We agreed that this was good for now, but we also didn't want to lose sight of the fact that we might wanna revisit this. So I think the whole idea of a comprehensive review and how each of these reference points fit together. We've talked also about the need for maybe reviewing the shape of the harvest control rule and how those reference points fit on that curve. We have a series of curves and straight lines, and I know the work group is getting into work on that piece too. So I think we do want to keep the work

moving forward. I think we've heard a lot of support for reviewing the methods so that the work group can continue on. So I guess I would just be encouraging that we proceed with the review, but maybe let's hold off on applying the outcome of the review until we have all of the pieces available to us, which may take some period of time. That's sort of different than how we've approached methods review and the outcomes from methods review in the past, but recognizing the very clear comments that we've received from the public and the SAS and the need for transparency and broader review and considering policy pieces in addition to just the technical, I think that's appropriate here. So with that, I guess I would offer a motion if I may?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:07] Please go ahead if you're ready.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:16:16] Thank you. I move the Council approve adding the Sacramento Work Group Items 1 and 3 as topics selected for inclusion on the preliminary draft list of methods to be reviewed at the fall 2025 Methods Review Meeting. However, the outcomes of review of these two items shall not be applied to annual management or apply to annual determinations of overfishing, overfished, or approaching an overfished condition until the Council completes a holistic review of the Sacramento Work Group's recommendations for all updated Sacramento fall Chinook reference points, conservation objective, and the harvest control rule. To facilitate the Council's understanding of the holistic view, I request that Council staff in consultation with the STT and Sacramento Work Group produce a document that outlines appropriate steps forward and their sequence necessary to achieve the Sacramento River fall Chinook Conservation Objective and to bring that document back at the September 2025 Council meeting.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:24] Thank you Marci. As I read along, the language on the screen appeared accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:17:32] That's correct.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:32] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Looking around. Seconded by John North. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:17:43] I think I just did. Thank you so much.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:47] All right, thank you. Are there any questions for clarification on the motion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:17:54] Thanks Vice, and thanks Miss Yaremko for this. We're a little scrolled down, but I'm going to rely on my short-term memory here. The process that I think you're suggesting, does that...have you thought about that in terms of our Council Operating Procedures and how this fits in with those four methodology review?

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

**Marci Yaremko** [00:18:24] I can't say that I've looked at them in the last few minutes, but what I can say is I believe there is discretion with the way the review is conducted that the Council may provide guidance following the review on the application of the methods that were reviewed. So rather than wait until we complete that review, I think it's fair to put out now that we would not be intending to have that review be completed and that we'd be immediately jumping into use of management of that review beginning with the next cycle. So that's my intent here. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:08] Thank you. Other questions for clarification? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:19:12] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Is it the intent of this motion that the work group take into account some of the points in my presentation in terms of river productivity so that any recommendations are consistent with the system as we understand it today?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:41] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:19:43] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe in the interchange with Dr. Satterthwaite, it sounded like, I mean clearly there was consideration of a flow covariate. I thought I understood that there have been some considerations maybe not in the same way that your presentation proposed, but I also believe there will be a work group meeting that occurs between now and September and I would expect the methods review documentation to be due two weeks before the methods review meeting so that I believe the work group will have another bite at the apple. But I may be unclear there, which is again, I think why we're at tasking Council staff to work with the work group on sequencing and the content of the items. So I would say that's a long-winded way of saying yes, that's my thought.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:20:54] I'll have something more during discussion. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:59] All right. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:21:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. The last paragraph it talks about asking Council staff to produce, along with the other committees, produce a document that outlines appropriate steps forward necessary to achieve the conservation objective. So just so that I'm clear what exactly we're asking the staff to do, I mean when I read, "achieve the conservation objective", I think in terms of fundamentally achieving it, like what will we have.....if the conservation objectives is 180,000 adults to the river, what do we, you know what are the steps we would do to make that happen, or are you really referencing just the steps to essentially finalize the process for the Council to adopt a new or not conservation objective. Do you see the fundamental difference between that?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:07] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:22:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss Kiefer. In my haste I probably didn't make the greatest word choice there with "achieve". I think probably a more appropriate word would have been "update" the conservation objective, which was the goal as we outlined in the TOR. So my apologies and I would certainly appreciate a friendly amendment. Thanks.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:22:36] Thank you. That clarity answers my question exactly.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:40] All right. And is the intent there clear to everyone on what that means? I mean it could be clarified through amendment, but Susan Bishop. Let me go to Executive Director Burden first.

**Merrick Burden** [00:23:01] Yeah, thank you. Since you're asking if everyone is clear. This would task me and my staff with this so I want to make sure I'm clear. I take the meaning the SRFC conservation objective to be shorthand for the conservation objectives reference points, that package of stuff that goes along together, is that consistent with what you intended Miss Yaremko?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:23:26] Yes, thank you Executive Director Burden. I think I did reference all of those in the text above. So yes, this holistic package that includes reference points, conservation objective, harvest control rule. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:46] Thank you. Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:23:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm not sure how to do this, but maybe a possible revision of the wording in that last paragraph is to refer to the previous paragraph. So the holistic review, somehow so that it's clear with Marci's clarification that that's what it's referring to, is that full package of components, or to simply repeat those, that list?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:24:30] Let me make sure on the question you're asking. Are you talking about a potential amendment to it or just asking for clarification on the intent?

**Susan Bishop** [00:24:45] I think I'm probably requesting, suggesting an amendment to basically reflect the clarification that Miss Yaremko offered. I have to say I'm not exactly sure how to do, the best way to do that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:12] I'm trying to think here. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:25:16] Yes, thank you. If your question is simple mechanics, the amendment would come in the form of a motion. And so you would offer up some new revised text to reflect what your suggestion is and then we would proceed to vote on that amendment and then vote on the amended motion if it passes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:35] Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:25:44] So just one more step. Would that come in the form of a friendly amendment then?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:25:50] Well I think just an amendment to it. I've heard in other forums there is no such thing as a friendly amendment. So if you want to amend the language, I think the first step is your clear understanding of what the intent is here, what is implied in that so it could be accurately captured and you can offer an amendment to the motion. Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:26:23] I would like to offer an amendment to the motion that would revise the language in the last paragraph, scrolling down a little further, the language in the final paragraph replacing, "achieve the SRFC conservation objective", with, can you scroll up just a little bit? In achieving, and replace that with, "in achieving the holistic review of the work group's recommendations for all updated reference points, conservation objectives, and the harvest control rule as described in the workgroups Terms Of Reference".

**Pete Hassemer** [00:27:32] Can you repeat those....maybe they'll capture it with a cut and paste here. Then can you highlight in a different color where it starts, "that in achieving.....? And then I will ask Susan if that's the language you are adding and if it's what you want?

**Susan Bishop** [00:28:25] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. With just one edit, at the very beginning of the green highlighted section, instead of, "in achieving", it should be, "to achieve". If that meets the spirit of Miss Yaremko's.....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:37] Okay. So now I think I'll let you read it over and then I'll ask if what's up there, the deletion and then the addition in green is as you intend and accurate?

**Susan Bishop** [00:29:01] Yes it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:03] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to it as needed.

**Susan Bishop** [00:29:17] The intent of the amendment to the motion was to clarify what was to be brought back and considered in September of 2025 and the task to the Council staff.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:32] All right, thank you. Any questions? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:29:37] Thanks Vice. Thanks Miss Bishop for this. As I'm reading this it's reading very circular in terms of we're asking for a holistic review, but to understand the holistic review we are going to produce a document that outlines the steps to achieve the holistic review. Am I missing something?

**Susan Bishop** [00:30:11] I don't think you're missing, at least from my perspective, I don't think you are missing anything. It's basically our intent is to conduct a holistic review. Here are the sequence and the steps to do that to achieve those end results.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:26] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:30:33] Could you outline for me what those sequence and steps are?

**Susan Bishop** [00:30:39] As I see it, that's the task that we are tasking the Council staff with.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:57] Okay, as everyone reads and thinks about that, are there any other questions for clarification? Not seeing questions, discussion on the motion to amend? Not seeing any hands for discussion then I'll call the question regarding the motion to amend the original motion. The parts to amend were on the screen. I want to make sure it's clear and it's before us. Language to be added is highlighted there in green. Motion to be deleted is indicated with strike out in a yellow highlight. All those in favor of the motion say "Yes".

**Council** [00:31:54] Aye. Yes. Yep.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:56] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Now we'll go back to the main motion as amended. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:32:19] Are we in discussion now?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:22] Let me make sure. Is there any other question for clarification? There is. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:32:29] Thanks Vice. This just goes back to the original intent, so I think this is a question for Miss Yaremko, which is I hear we're asking the Council staff for a little support here, but in terms of better understanding what that might look like, can you speak a little bit more to what a holistic review entails in your mind and what the goals of that holistic review would be?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:32:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thinking back to the Terms Of Reference and the work that we've tasked the work group to undertake, we know we are operating with a conservation objective that is not well-founded in today's reality. So we've tasked them with updating that objective, as well as the associated reference points that all come together to develop the framework for management of this stock. So considering we've already looked last year at the max allowable exploitation rate, that's one piece, one point on the harvest control rule, their job is to look at all of them and to bring us back all of those pieces together holistically to ensure that they can fit together. Kind of approaching this piecemeal is causing some consternation and we haven't thought about how they all work together in tandem, but they must work together in the aggregate for us to be managing I think as we're intending. So rather than applying more of the reference points in kind of a, I'm going to call it piecemeal fashion, before we deem them to be used in management we should be considering everything together as a package. So that's my intention here is that we develop a timeline and a path forward for developing those elements and bringing them forward for review and discussion. So that's where I'm hoping Council staff can work with the work group to come up with that plan forward which also should help with transparency and provide more opportunities for review. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:35:04] Thank you. Other questions for clarification? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:35:15] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Obviously I'm going to support the motion, but I still have some concerns. I think that anything coming out of the work group needs to be ground truthed against the data that we have, the actual performance data as opposed to something else. And I think we heard a suggestion that perhaps the work group was headed towards an escapement target of 290,000 natural spawners, but we see that in our current environment once the natural spawners go beyond 100,000 we drop below this recruitment ratio of 2.4 and we actually get to below 1. The Munsch paper I believe is based on flows, and juvenile production versus flows, and that's certainly a very valid way to evaluate the success of spawning success. The problem we have, for example this year and every year, is that here we are in the spring of 2025 trying to set an escapement target that will produce adults in 2028. We don't know what the flows are going to be in the period where the juveniles resulting from this year's escapement are going to rear and, you know, eventually out-migrate. And we as a Council obviously don't have any control over those flows. So it's hard for me to imagine how we could this year, for example, set an escapement target based on flows on next year's flows that we don't know. And so I don't think that prevents the work group working going forward, but I do think that I need to better understand how looking at flows we don't know will help us set an escapement target.



**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:47] Thank you. Other discussion on this topic, on this motion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:38:01] Thanks Vice. I am not going to vote for this motion, but I wanted to explain that and some thinking that I want to put out here for everyone. It's, first of all, my appreciation to Miss Yaremko for the motion and the thinking behind this. As I understand it, we had a robust discussion this morning in the California delegation and I found that very helpful and understand where this is coming from and understanding some of the challenges associated with all of this and the process and transparency and one of the issues the Council will forever deal with, which is science to management and policy translation. The way I'm understanding this motion, I think, is not in line as we were described at the beginning of this item by Council staff in terms of how methodologies review go, which is at the end of a review. That information is taken to the SSC and they make the determination about the quality of those methods and make a BSIA determination. And my understanding is that it is not up to us. We use a BSIA determination, that's not ours to make. So I have a concern that sort of the process outlined here in this motion doesn't really comport with how we do business and sort of how those processes and procedures work for us. I also have some overarching concerns about, you know, we have this process about how we're bringing this science into our management, and again wanting to keep with really a robust translation and making sure that it's done in a transparent way and making sure our public can be included in that and making sure it is going through our management bodies and ultimately the SSC in the way that we've described in a way that upholds that scientific integrity. So again I thank the maker of the motion and I will not be voting for it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:17] Thank you. Further discussion? Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:40:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think the other thing to keep in mind here, and I think potentially was part of the impetus for this motion, is that it does not all involve technical aspects and technical decisions. It also involves the framework as a whole, involves a significant amount of policy discussion and policy decisions in terms of what the Council adopts. Part of the assignment to the work group is to provide the Council information that allows the Council to assess trade-offs between fisheries and conservation in adopting ultimately the framework. And I think I have been reminded by some of the advisory bodies that we need to be very careful about protecting them in getting into policy questions or assigning them tasks that actually involve policy questions. And so I guess I would just throw out that reminder in the hope that this helps to walk that line.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:29] Any further discussion? Looking around the table I'm not seeing any so I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

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

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:44] Opposed?

**Corey Ridings** [00:41:48] No.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:41:49] Abstentions? The motion passes with one no vote. And with that, again before I look around for any other hands for discussion, just to refresh ourselves on what needs to be done I'll ask Angela to make sure we're on track in doing what we need here?

**Angela Forristall** [00:42:21] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So you did have two tasks under this agenda item to provide guidance regarding the potential preliminary topics for review in 2025. And a part of that to request relevant agencies develop and provide the needed material. So from my understanding of the discussion is the Council has decided to move forward the OPIH forecast approach that was taken in 2025 for review with the OPITT Team taking the lead on that. There was a discussion of a desire that maybe there'd be a greater look at this OPI forecast methodology but that there may be some OPITT staffing constraints, and so that when we come back in September with final topic selection we can revisit that. The Council has also recommended moving forward Sacramento River Work Group Topics 1 and 3 for review in 2025 at the methodology review, but to hold incorporating them into management until a later time. And as a part of that, tasking Council staff to develop a roadmap document outlining the steps and sequencing the work group will need to take to update these reference points, conservation objective, and harvest control rules as outlined in the workgroup's Terms Of Reference.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:43:43] All right, thank you Angela. So very, through the motion, very clear regarding the SRWG Work Group, or I hope it was clear, work group items 1 and 3 and the roadmap, but the Council, and thank you for reminding us on the OPI, that there was support from that. I think Mr. Adicks, Mr. North, Miss Ridings, gave some support in what they wanted to see. And again the step now is to see what's ready for review and the final decision occurs at the September meeting. Is there anything else people would like to see on that or have we completed our work here? I'm not seeing any other hands, so Angela it looks like we've completed work under this agenda item so we'll close that out.

## 5. Review of Essential Fish Habitat – Scoping

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] So with that, takes us to our Council tasks there before us, consider scoping document, call for information, any feedback you want to provide, and adopt that. Kerry was there something you wanted to say? Or maybe I should let you summarize the task, please.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:00:22] That's fine. I think you were doing a fine job summarizing the tasks. They are in front of you. I also had those in my presentation. The one thing that is, I think the action says adopt the scope and schedule, and typically that means a motion. I don't think that you necessarily need to make a motion here. Sometimes guidance on how to proceed is just as effective, but it would be helpful to hear what the Council envisions. Assuming you want to move forward, what sort of considerations you might want the team to make sure to pay attention to. Like we've heard concerns about staffing and resources and some uncertainties that we're all well aware of. I also know that the leads here, Eric and Corey and I, are committed to communicating and coordinating and adapting as need be and communicating back with the Director, you know as necessary. So anyway that's all I'll say that you know this is your opportunity to to provide some sort of guidance as we move forward and it doesn't have to be in the form of a motion but that's really up to the Council.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:51] Thank you Kerry. With that I'll let you think about it and see if there are any hands here to initiate discussion. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:02:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. The last time the Council took this up was before my time on the Council, which has been 10 plus years now so it's been a while, so really appreciated Kerry's presentation to the SAS and here today to help me understand what the process is. Appreciated Mr. North's question about state agency involvement. I'll go back home and try to figure out who the best point of contact with WDFW is, not prepared to do that today. If the Council decides they want to take this up through motion I can take a shot at a motion that I think will cover it. If not, then that's fine too.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:41] All right, thank you. See where people are falling on this. Susan Bishop then Sharon Kiefer.

**Susan Bishop** [00:02:49] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And let me know if I'm speaking out of turn here, but I just want to underscore I think this work is important. You know it's been 10 years since we've taken a look at it so I think it's time to start the process, but NMFS is very cognizant of the limitations on staff at the various agencies, and Lord knows we're in the storm right now, so we don't know exactly what this is going to look like. We don't exactly what the range of feedback is we're going to get. You know we have gotten some indications for some information we'll get. So I would just, I guess, from NMFS the caution is to be very flexible and adaptable. I like the idea of the check-ins from the group to sort of consider where we are to give us maybe a guidance with regard to the schedule, but I think we would be concerned if the schedule was viewed as a requirement or a mandate. It's sort of a good guiding light for us to be able to see where we are as we go forward and adjust as necessary. So I just wanted to sort of lay out NMFS's thoughts on that before we took any action.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:10] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer. Let's let Executive Director Burden respond to that first.

**Merrick Burden** [00:04:21] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and thank you Miss Kiefer for letting me step in front of you. We at the staff office also share the concerns that NMFS has about capacity, and I think really what that ties back to is something that Mr. Griffin raised about whether you should make a motion or provide guidance. I take motions very seriously and I try to follow them to the letter. And so in this case I think it'd be most appropriate to provide some guidance back to us and we'll do what we can as we learn more about how our capacities unfold.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:52] Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:04:54] I think I'm on the.....I'm certainly on the same page as Miss Bishop and the Executive Director, and certainly I think as we talk about things like schedule and so forth, if we can present them as provisional or certainly just not create that expectation with the public that they're going to give us comments and get some sort of an immediate outcome or even near term outcome because I recognize it's a challenging time with a lot of uncertainties, but you guys are great at rockin' and rollin' through that kind of stuff, and I agree with just giving guidance.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:36] Other discussion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:05:40] Thanks Vice. I agree with everything that's been said so far. I did want to just lightly underscore the call for information, which I think is really important in this process, especially in light of what we heard today from the Confederated Tribes of the Colville, which is that they have information that they're looking to bring forward. I would like to make sure that we create space for that as well as from any other tribes or any other public interests that might have information that's relevant, given it has been over 10 years since we've had this opportunity. So just kind of wanted to underscore the importance of that, but definitely agree with what's been said around the table.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:23] Thank you. Any other thoughts? Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:06:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I certainly support asking the Council staff to proceed with the call for information and data. That's one of the first steps that has to happen. I support the scope and objectives that were laid out and the schedule might be aspirational given the uncertainties, but I think it's a goal that we could work towards and if we realize it's going to be delayed, then it's delayed, but that would be my guidance.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:01] Let me see if there's any response to that moving forward with the call for information. Support for, I don't know how to say this, for the schedule or the process, but the timing of that is uncertain at this time. Did I capture that? Is there agreement? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:07:29] Yeah, just a question on the call for information. Maybe I missed this. I'm sorry if I did. This appears to be a Federal Register Notice that would publish, but are there other plans for posting? No? Okay, so maybe explain for me the different locations we plan to post it, make the notice available to the public, is this going on the website, what's the plan? Thank you.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:07:59] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, Miss Yaremko. We wouldn't put it in the Federal Register, but we would post it on our website. We would, you know, we don't have the plan set in stone but we'd probably do that. We'd send out to our listserv and probably a reminder at some point, pointing them back to where the announcement lives. We'd send it to our....make

sure our advisory bodies are aware. We have a lot of University contacts in our Council world and NGO contacts and we would ask that they distribute it far and wide as possible and you know I'd be open to any other suggestions. I'm sure there's things that I'm meeting, or missing. There may be listservs, you know, maybe with, you know, various organizations or entities, you know American Fisheries Society, or a lot of these organizations have an opportunity to post information like this. So a lot of it would be organic, but we have a pretty wide network and a pretty broad reach and so we would use whatever tools we can.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:18] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:09:18] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Kerry. Just on the question of a Federal Register Notice. Is there hesitation with that or is it just not required and we're trying to keep workload down? Maybe someone can speak to that. Thanks.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:09:35] Sure, I'll take a shot and then maybe Director Burden can follow-up. But in the past when we've issued these, that's the way we've done it. We don't go the Federal Register route. It's not, you know, it's not under, we're not noticing a, you know a publicly noticed meeting. And, you know, I don't know that we can't, but in the past we've done it more, you know, through our own network and it seems to have been effective, but Merrick might have some more detail on that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:12] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:10:14] Thank you. Not a whole lot of additional detail to what Mr. Griffin outlined. I just see the purpose of a Federal Register Notice as being different than the purpose of a call for information like the one we're describing here.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:34] All right. David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:10:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Yeah, we would think the tribal involvement here would be essential. And we do have people from California in the Yurok and Hoopa on the Habitat Committee so they could be made aware of and on the SAS. And then we have our two commissions, the Northwest Indian Fish Commission that have people here and available, and the Northwest Indian Fish Commission. And then Coville has been attending and should be able to contact and provide information.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:10] All right, thank you. And as we go through I always should let Kerry summarize, but we have some agree.....or I believe I've seen agreement around the table about going forward with a call for information, scoping document. I do have in my mind, I want to make sure everybody's clear on the schedule and the process. The scoping document does have some dates in there, but as Mr. Adick's pointed out, they're ambitious and we don't know. Kerry, is it the expectation that we should ignore those at this time and expect a check-in down the road? Or what would be the process relative to the dates and the proposed schedule?

**Kerry Griffin** [00:12:01] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think you summarized those pretty well. You know given the uncertainties, you know we do not, we don't need to adopt this schedule as final. It says proposed. If it were something that were more set in stone, we'd do things like put it on the Year-At-a-Glance Calendar. It's not on there now and we probably don't want to put it on

there right now. But periodic check-ins, you know, with the Council and other organizations would be important and, you know, at some point if we're moving forward and, you know, we're looking to April 2026 Phase 1 Report then we'll want to, you know, put it on the Year-At-a-Glance calendar and get it put on an agenda. But I think we've heard pretty good guidance here. Move forward somewhat cautiously and issue the call for information. The scope and schedule and team seem generally acceptable with the caveat of being flexible with timing. I appreciate the input from the tribes and the state reps here on providing liaisons or subject matter experts as possible. Yeah, and so I think that that pretty much summarizes everything. Move forward. Be aware of some of the limitations. Don't set a schedule in stone yet.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:47] All right, thank you. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:13:50] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I'm a little late on this but everything we've said is in accordance with the second paragraph in the Habitat Committee Report. I think if you do need something on the record that says this is how we're going to proceed we could say that the Council agrees with the Habitat Committee Report on this item. Thank you Chair, Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:12] Thank you. With that, is there anything else anyone needs to say? I believe Kerry has said we've got everything we need or we think we can do today. I'm not seeing any hands so thank you all for your work on this agenda item. We will close that out and I believe I am going to pass the gavel back to our Chair.

## 6. Further Direction on 2025 Management Measures

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes reports and the public comment. Any discussion, or this is the time for providing any needed guidance to assist the STT. And I'll look around. My usual starter here, Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have some guidance for the Council today. So this guidance is relative to Agenda Item D.3.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 12th, 2025. I had to go back around, as Angela pointed out, what the STT brought us today didn't actually have all the regulatory information in it so I went back to the previous STT Report. Implement the following changes on Table 1, the WDFW Commercial Management Section beginning on Page 1, under Supplemental Management Information, modify trade to read, "Commercial troll traded 9,000 marked coho to the recreational fishery for 2,250 Chinook. The Chinook are to be removed from recreational subareas as listed in the table below and added to the July-September troll fishery. Coho are to be removed from the commercial troll fishery and added to the recreational subareas as listed on the table below". And the table it shows 1,000 Chinook traded from Neah Bay, 450 from Westport, and 800 from Ilwaco for a total of 2,250. And coho received, 940 in Neah Bay, 230 in LaPush, 3,330 in Westport, and 4,500 in Ilwaco for a total of 9,000. Recalculate the non-Indian commercial troll TAC for Chinook and coho to reflect this trade. And then for the U.S.- Canada border to Cape Falcon in the spring season, adjust the catch limits for the U.S.- Canada border to Queets River area as no more than 9,000 Chinook. And the Leadbetter Point to Cape Falcon area, no more 6,000 chinook. And then in Table 2, WDFW recreational management beginning on page 7, under Supplemental Management Information, recalculate recreational troll TAC for Chinook and coho to reflect the trade described in the Commercial Management Information above. Recalculate all subarea guidelines and quotas accordingly. And for the Neah Bay and LaPush Subareas modify the daily limits as follows: Open seven days per week June 21st to July 3rd, all salmon except coho, one salmon per day. And then beginning July 4th, all salmon, two salmon per day. And again, that's the same regulation change for the Neah Bay Subarea and the LaPush Subarea. And that's what I have for today. There's been a lot of work over the past 24 hours plus to try to get to the finish line with some of our Puget Sound critical stocks, our Coastal coho stocks. Also keeping an eye on Columbia River summers, trying to keep our impact down on those as we step forward. We had some inside changes that were ready yesterday but there wasn't an official STT run, so we'll get those in for tonight's run and may have some additional inside fishery changes as well that will come through that process.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:13] All right, thank you Kyle. Since this is going to the STT, let me check in with Dr. O'Farrell and just see if it's all clear? Good. All right, thank you. Let me go over to Oregon. John, anything here?

**John North** [00:03:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This afternoon Oregon doesn't have any guidance to provide. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:37] All right, thank you. Let me continue around. California. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:44] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have some guidance. Looking at Agenda Item D.3.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 12th, 2025, implement the following

changes to Table 1. Point Reyes to Point Sur, San Francisco and Monterey Subarea: Remove the September season dates, quota, vessel limit, and associated 2025 regulatory language. Replace with closed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:33] All right, thank you. Again, Dr. O'Farrell no questions on that? Okay. And that completes it Marci? The guidance?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:04:44] Yes, that completes it. I would like a chance to speak to it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:48] Sure, go ahead.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:04:49] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And with that, I'd like to call up George Bradshaw.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:58] George, welcome.

**George Bradshaw** [00:05:03] Good afternoon Council. You know I'll take the opportunity as well, you know, to speak to this decision for commercial fleet and your decisions through SAS. You know it wasn't without a whole lot of trying. I tend to see these last few years these Council meetings are more draining than actually going fishing. I mean it's tough business when you're trying to figure out how to get opportunity when there isn't any there. I know that everybody tried to go turn over every stone and shake out every cushion to try to figure out a way to get some kind of access, but at the end of the day, you know, the public comment before me there was just, you know, risk and unknown uncertainty everywhere. You know this fall fishery was the last that we had on paper and we all, I think, here know that it's associated with what's called a credit card fishery. No one knows that interest rate until next year when we got to go pay it. And you know with the very limited opportunity in the super small subarea, you know that bill that was going to have to be paid by the whole fleet looming in all the unknown and risk just didn't make sense. You know and that's where we came from and brought forward the decision that we've got here today.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:45] All right, thank you.

**George Bradshaw** [00:06:47] Yep, thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:52] Any more comments on that or questions? Not seeing any, thank you George. And David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:07:08] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I do have some guidance today. Ah, there it is. For the ocean troll fishery I provide the following guidance and analysis by the STT. Alternative 1, which is the only alternative we have now, is 45,000 Chinook and 37,500 coho. The alternatives consist of a May 1 through June 30th Chinook directed fishery and a July 1 start date to all-species fishery, Chinook and coho. The season structure with regard to a closing date is still under discussion among the tribes. The Chinook quota will be divided, split between the two time periods.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:02] All right, thank you. And again Dr. O'Farrell, any questions? No questions. Anything else you wanted to speak to on that?



**David Sones** [00:08:12] Ah just briefly. I really appreciate how much work has gone into getting to this number. It's been real difficult for all the parties and just want to thank them for getting us to this point. I know it hasn't been easy. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:29] All right. Also appreciate all the work. I know it's hard. I'll look around and see if there's anything else here. Otherwise, check-in with Angela. Susan Bishop first.

**Susan Bishop** [00:08:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just have one question for Kyle. He and I touched bases on this just a little bit previous to the session here, but I just wanted to confirm with Kyle that the trades meet the requirements of the FMP in terms of port allocations and the different steps that need to be taken with regard to the trades?

**Kyle Adicks** [00:09:03] I believe they do.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:07] All right, thank you. Any other questions? Discussion? Angela.

**Angela Forristall** [00:09:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We received guidance from Washington, California, and the tribes, and the STT will work that into their next report that they will bring to you tomorrow.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:27] All right, thank you very much. I believe that completes this agenda item.

## 7. Further Direction on 2025 Management Measures

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes reports, public comment, takes us to our task here, provide any additional guidance needed on this. So might as well continue the way we've done it in the past and I'm just going to start in the north with Washington. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have some guidance today. So this is relative to Agenda Item D.7.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 14th, 2025. Implement the following changes for the WDFW Commercial Management Alternatives beginning on Page 1. For the U.S.-Canada border to Cape Falcon spring season: Adjust the catch limit for the season to 36,800 Chinook. Adjust the catch limit for the area between the U.S.-Canada border and Queets River to 8,000 Chinook. Adjust the U.S.-Canada border to Queets River to 100 Chinook per vessel per landing week. And adjust the Leadbetter Point to Cape Falcon to 80 Chinook per vessel per landing week. For the U.S.-Canada border to Cape Falcon summer season: Adjust the catch limit for the season to 24,450 Chinook. Adjust the landing and possession limit for July 1 through 9 to 60 coho per vessel for that period. Adjust the landing and possession limit beginning July 10th to 60 coho per vessel per landing week. So that one sentence should have said, "for that period", instead of, "per landing week". Thank you. And moving down to Table 2, WDFW Recreational Management Alternatives beginning on Page 7. For Leadbetter Point to Cape Falcon, the Columbia River Subarea: Adjust the season to June 25 through the earlier of September 30th, or attainment of the quota or guideline. Open seven days per week, all salmon, two salmon per day, no more than one of which may be a Chinook. Coho must be marked with a healed adipose fin clip. So these we have done a lot of work over the past two days north of Falcon to try to meet the management objectives for all of our Chinook and coho stocks. The changes to the catch limits in the spring and summer seasons and that in the northern part of the coast in the troll fishery are to lower impacts on Puget Sound stocks and help us get to those objectives there. The change to the recreational fishery is just a delay to the start date. We had a couple different things and alternatives and this is where we landed once we saw where the quotas and guidelines were falling out for this year. A lot of additional model inputs will be coming for inside fisheries. There was an error found in the Queets freshwater input, as Mr. Sones's referenced, that should fix that, make that stock meet its management objective, and I believe with what we have for other fisheries. What we see tomorrow should meet all of our objectives. And I'll just thank the Council again for your patience over the past couple of days as we had to delay late into the day to get back here with some guidance.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:08] All right, thank you Kyle. And I'll check-in with Dr. O'Farrell if there's any questions? No. All right, thanks. Next, we'll move to Oregon. John North.

**John North** [00:03:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Oregon doesn't have any guidance today.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:25] All right, thank you. And I'll turn to my right, California. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:31] No guidance, thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:32] All right, thanks. And further down. David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:03:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have some, and I'm not sure where this fits in, but the Yurok and Klamath tribes asked me to provide guidance that maybe you'll have to type out as I.....it's short and I'm.....okay, they want to maximize the tribal harvest of adult Klamath River fall Chinook per the harvest control rule. Maximize the tribal harvest of the adult Klamath River Chinook, fall Chinook per the harvest control rule. And a 50-50 tribal/non-tribal sharing. And I guess maybe that Marci can help a little with what we were trying to do there is get it more into the, language into the model runs, I guess, is where we're trying to put this. They didn't give me a great lot of guidance on how to implement this in but maybe it's just in the way we're putting the model runs together.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:10] Marci.

**David Sones** [00:05:10] If she can understand that.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:05:12] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess I would ask Dr. O'Farrell to come up and confirm, but I believe this has already been taken care of. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:24] Go ahead Dr. O'Farrell.

**Michael O'Farrell** [00:05:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. That's true. We implemented that prior to this last round and so that has been completed.

**David Sones** [00:05:36] Okay, great. Thank you. And then I also have from the QTA Tribes would like to come up and provide some guidance that I think we will get up on the screen also if they could come up.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:55] Okay. Give them time to get up here. Good afternoon gentlemen.

**Cleve Jackson** [00:06:02] Kweeleolith. Good day. Again, Cleve Jackson, Fishery Policy Spokesperson, Quinault Indian Nation. My position is codified under Title 51, one of our governing documents. We've been a governing tribe for over 100 years. A little bit more of who I am. I'm the seventh generation from our treaty signer, my grandfather, Chief Teholah. You know we're a tribe, well we're a nation of about 5,000 members. And we are a fishing community and, you know we are very passionate and we care deeply about our fish and that's why we're here today in front of you all. I'll kick it over to Chet Tweed.

**Chet Tweed** [00:07:13] Good afternoon again Council. My name's Chet Tweed. I'm a Quinault Tribal Member. I'm the policy representative for the Quinault Indian Nation and I'm a lifelong Queets River fisherman. I take a lot of pride in that river. I come from a small community on the West Coast of Washington State and I take a lot pride from where I come from. A lot of people have their perspective views of different areas within our state and all over everywhere else, and I know you all take pride in where you come from. I come from such a small community that fish mean the world to us. So I also commend and thank all of you sitting up there in front of us for doing the work that you do to help manage and to help make sure some of our stocks get back to us because that's what we fully rely on. We don't have a lot of opportunity coming from my little community. So it's my strong belief that we're sitting up here before you today because we do stuff for a reason, and we believe strongly that there's a reason behind what we're pushing for right now and our request moving forward. We have to go home and answer to our people, just like you have

to answer to everybody throughout everybody's fisheries. So we're up here today to read the testimony on behalf of the QTA Tribes. Quinault Treaty area Tribes oppose extending the treaty fishery, treaty troll fishery through September 30th. Any proposal to modify the treaty troll season length or evaluate its impacts through test fishing must be developed jointly and agreed to by all affected co-managers. QTA is committed to working with the co-managers to develop a multi-year genetic-based test fishery and all north of Falcon ocean management areas to improve understanding of shifts in stock composition through September. For several decades, the treaty troll fishery has extended from May 1st to September 15th and has provided sufficient opportunity to harvest annual Chinook and coho quotas. The treaty troll fishery has been closed no later than September 15th as a precautionary measure to reduce the risk of over-harvesting Washington north coast natural-origin coho stocks as coho originating from the Fraser River, Columbia River, and Puget Sound migrate away from the Washington north coast. As a precautionary measure, we request that all ocean fisheries, treaty troll, non-treaty troll, or non-treaty commercial and recreational off the Washington coast be closed no later than September 15th. And once again, thank you for your time and thank you the work that all of you do.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:11] Thank you for that. Let me look around and see if anybody has any questions regarding the testimony. And seeing no questions, thank you very much for that and your time here.

**Cleve Jackson** [00:10:24] May I follow-up with a little history? When this first came up for Quinault Indian Nation back in the in the 90's solely to protect Washington coastal stocks because they tend to have, tend to face major concerns throughout time and you know we brought this forward and we wanted September closed, but we understand this is a shared resource, a shared fishery, and we met in the middle. Just need to, felt the need to share.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:11] Thank you.

**David Sones** [00:11:12] That is all I have. I'm not sure how we will put this into guidance, but the testimony was important that they could get that position out. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:24] Great, thank you. Anything else here before we.....Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:11:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So just a clarification for Mr. Sones. So the current guidance for the treaty troll fishery would remain the September XX text that's in the guidance that we have currently?

**David Sones** [00:11:51] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Susan, yes, I think that we would, there's no....until we get to the end here and make final motions tomorrow those dates would be open as far as I can tell, we'll see. We're giving these groups time to continue to work on those dates and hope they can get it resolved for us tomorrow so we can a final date in there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:26] Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:12:27] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was not quick enough with my hand to ask questions of the gentlemen representatives from the Quinault Tribe to find out when the test fishery that might occur would occur and how it would fit into sort of the timeframe that we're talking about for the fisheries that are out there in the ocean. So that would be something I would

appreciate clarity on in the interim between now and tomorrow. We would want to make sure that those impacts from that test fishery or evaluation fishery, whatever ends up being proposed, were included in the modeling and that we would make sure that we covered that in the regulatory text that we had so that those fisheries would be able to go forward during the season, and I understand there'll be greater clarity coming it sounds like.

**David Sones** [00:13:28] Yes. The test fishery last year was from September 15, after it closed, to September 30th. But I'm not clear on what they're asking. You know, is it the whole month of September that they're taking data down? And because we did use, they did use genetic data. We're usually using coded-wire tag data being collected so it would require some extra data to be brought in. Maybe Cleve can up and clarify.....

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:59] Who can address it directly?

**David Sones** [00:14:05] Chet.

**Chet Tweed** [00:14:05] Thank you for the question. To bring clarity, we would like to conduct, well first and foremost, inter-tribally with our treaty troll co-managers, we would like to develop a test fishery for the last two weeks of September. Last year there was a test fishery that ended up taking place. We weren't a part of that. We've seen that presentation when all of you've seen that, but that test fishery that was produced to the Council yesterday was only in Area 4. And the plan moving forward would be to capture test fisheries in Areas 2, 3, and 4. And our request is to try to do a multi-year genetic testing to evaluate, and like I previously mentioned, if we're going to do it, do it right. But we wanted to make sure all areas were accounted for when we conduct that test fishery.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:08] Thank you. Susan.

**Susan Bishop** [00:15:09] Thank you. I just want to express appreciation for that clarity. Thank you. We will just need, NMFS will just need to make sure that the timeframe is defined in the final action tomorrow that we take for the treaty troll fisheries so that the intent of say the commercial fishery as well as any test fisheries are covered in those regulations so. And happy to work with you or answer any questions you have.

**Chet Tweed** [00:15:42] I appreciate it and thank you very much. Any further questions?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:49] It doesn't look like there's any, so thanks for coming up and clarifying that.

**Chet Tweed** [00:15:53] Thank you Council.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:55] All right, anything else here? And if there's nothing for you to add, one question we have, because the Executive Director and staff are working on scheduling and we need to think about organization tomorrow, when people think we might be able to reconvene for our final salmon agenda item here to take final action? Any preliminary thoughts? I know there's a lot of work and a lot of discussion that need to go on, but we need to be able to prepare and advance a little bit. Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:16:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I haven't tracked the Council schedule yet so I don't know. Do you have other items left to cover yesterday? Are you done except for salmon?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:43] Let me turn to Executive Director who handles all that scheduling.

**Merrick Burden** [00:16:50] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. So we do have two agenda items remaining on our docket. We do have future meeting planning, of course, per usual, and then final salmon action. I would recommend that our default be to come back tomorrow at nine rather than eight. That would give everyone a little bit of time in the morning to gather thoughts ahead of final action on salmon. And if we're not ready at nine we can pick up future meeting planning. That usually takes us about an hour or two and then salmon might be ready at that time. That's my thought, but happy to take other suggestions.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:25] All right. Kyle.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:17:32] I think that that makes sense to me. If we realize we're not quite ready at nine we'll have a little more time, but hopefully we can be ready by nine for North of Falcon.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:17:43] All right, thank you. Anything else? Otherwise, Angela does that complete the work here?

**Angela Forristall** [00:17:52] Yes, thank you. The Council has provided the STT with additional guidance, and so we look forward to coming back and reporting out, the STT will report back tomorrow.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:04] All right, that closes the agenda item. I need to pass the gavel back again to the Chair.

## 8. Final Action on 2025 Management Measures

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] All right, that completes our public comment and takes us to our Council task which is final action on this agenda item. Let's see if there's any discussion to be had before we look to any motions for final action. Is there anything that needs to be said? If not, then I'll change it up and go through sort of alphabetical order here. Start with Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:00:38] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I do have a motion for the Council today. I move that the Council adopt for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce the Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Salmon Management Measures for the area north of Cape Falcon as presented in Agenda Item D.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 15th, 2025 with the following modifications. On Table 1, the north of Falcon Commercial Troll Management Measures on Page 1. For the U.S.-Canada border to Cape Falcon summer season, for subareas north of Leadbetter Point: Change the season end date to September 15. On Table 2, north of Falcon Recreational Management Measures on Page 7, for the U.S.-Canada border to Leadbetter Point, the Neah Bay, LaPush, and Westport Subareas: Change season end dates to September 15. And for the Leadbetter to Cape Falcon, the Columbia River Subarea: Add, "prior to June 25th, possession of salmon on board a vessel is prohibited on days when the subarea is closed to salmon retention".

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:44] Thank you, I followed along. That language appears accurate and complete, is that correct?

**Kyle Adicks** [00:01:50] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:51] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:01:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. First, as always, thanks to the Salmon Technical Team, the Salmon Advisory Subpanel, all of the state, tribal, federal staff that were an enormous amount of work each year starting in January with our Pacific Salmon Commission meetings and leading straight from those winter meetings into our March and April Council meetings. We couldn't get here without all of you. Every year seems to give us a unique set of challenges for fishery planning north of Falcon. This year we had pretty strong Chinook abundances for Columbia River fall Chinook stocks that support our ocean fisheries, but continue to have critically low forecast for several Puget Sound stocks. The particular combination of stock and age compositions in our forecast this year led to differing levels of stock impact from last year for many of our fisheries in Puget Sound and required some significant reductions to those fisheries to meet our conservation objectives for Puget Sound stocks. Thanks to the Council for your patience this week as we worked through all those very difficult issues with inside fisheries in the final days of this meeting. The package in front of you does include a trade of Chinook and coho between the commercial troll and recreational fisheries. The trade does have the support of the Washington Salmon Advisory Subpanel representatives as it does enable both sectors to better meet their fishery management objectives. The trade is also consistent with the requirements of the Council's salmon fishery management plan. The closure date for fisheries north of Leadbetter Point is obviously an important issue for everyone involved in north of Falcon fisheries. And I appreciate the testimony we've heard this week from the Makah Tribe and the Quinault Treaty

Area Tribes, as well as the research results presented from 2024 by the Makah Tribe. I was hopeful as we moved through the week that we would at least find a compromise closure date somewhere between the middle and end of September. I am encouraged that there appears to be better coordination developing on the collection of additional data that should address concerns with the late September portion of the fishery and WDFW looks forward to being involved in that. This motion, with its earlier closure date, is not a statement about whether late September fisheries have some unacceptable or differential level of impact on coastal Washington coho stocks, and I am supportive of fisheries continuing through all of September. In case there are any questions later about differences in impact levels from the STT Report today, there will be small changes to impact estimates for non-treaty fisheries with these earlier closure dates that are not reflected in the current modeling, including increased impact to some coastal coho stocks, but none so large that they will affect meeting conservation objectives. There is one small regulatory change in this motion that does not affect modeling of fisheries, a regulation that has been used in the past when one subarea is open for salmon retention but the adjacent area is not. This is the case for the Columbia River and Westport Subareas before June 25th this year. So this change will restrict salmon possession in the Columbia River Subarea until it opens for salmon on June 25. This package meets all of our domestic and international conservation objectives for all of our stocks. It meets all other requirements of the Council FMP, and I'm pleased we were able to navigate all of the issues this week and have it before us for consideration today. And while I still have the floor I also want to thank Robin Ehlke. She's been extremely helpful to me during her time here with the Council and was extremely helpful to me back when she was working for the Department of Fish and Wildlife. I worked on Columbia River stuff with her for a while and always appreciated your willingness and eagerness to help Robin. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:33] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? There's no discussion. I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:05:51] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:52] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Kyle. Next in the alphabet, John North.

**John North** [00:06:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, Oregon does have a motion as shown on the screen. I move the Council adopt for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce the Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Salmon Management Measures for the area from Cape Falcon, Oregon to the Oregon-California border as described in Agenda Item D.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 15, 2025, including all season descriptions, minimum sizes and requirements, definitions, restrictions, and exceptions.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:36] Thank you John. I followed along. That language on the screen before us looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**John North** [00:06:44] It does. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:45] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.



**John North** [00:06:52] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have some thoughts to share. It's more than, more content than usual for me but I feel it's important so please bear with me. Sorry. This year's ocean salmon season setting process has been another tough one requiring difficult decisions. With the depressed forecast for both Klamath and Sacramento fall Chinook, it forces one to consider the fine balance of providing opportunity to fish with a risk posed to the resource. As I said last year, I recognize the challenges we're facing with our salmon stocks up and down the coast and I sure hope we can turn things around. The recent return of salmon to the upper Klamath Basin following the four dam removal project leaves me optimistic. I do acknowledge the painful decision made to close all troll opportunity in California for the third consecutive year. And the same goes for the heavily impacted California rec fishery. I truly do feel for the huge economic impact these closures and restrictions have on the California communities. But at the same time I've been moved by the conversations and testimony I've heard from the Oregon troll fleet of the shared pain felt from these constraining conditions since their fishery has been in disaster relief status for seven of the last nine years. And as a result of that, the Oregon fleet has been weakened over time and boats have been mothballed. So throughout this week, not only has the conservation of California fall Chinook stocks been on my mind, but so has the preservation of our fleet, our coastal communities, and the legacy of salmon fisheries to our state. As we began this season planning process, I was reminded of the responsibility trawlers hold, which is to provide an opportunity for the non-fishing public to experience and enjoy eating fresh wild salmon. And as more and more of our fleet is lost, so is the future opportunity to provide salmon to our communities. So the unfortunate reality of this preseason process to not only preserve our salmon runs, but also provide meaningful fishing opportunity is in Oregon, if possible, has been weighing on me. So this year the management criteria indicates there are some Sac and Klamath fall Chinook available for harvest. In working with our advisors and incorporating feedback from the public, Oregon has developed troll and sport salmon fisheries that will provide some opportunity to access healthier local salmon stocks while remaining within the overall management guidelines, ESA constraints, and recent harvest shares for both of those stocks. So in designing this year's fisheries our overall goal was to leverage the best fisheries possible while limiting impacts to constraining stocks. And to minimize impacts to Klamath River fall Chinook in the rec fishery we limited the season length, reduced the Chinook bag limit beginning in June, maintained our 24-inch minimum size, and we limited Chinook retention season in the KMZ. And on the troll side we restricted fishing in the KMZ for two weeks. Oh, sorry, to two weeks in April, and progressively move the fishery to the northern half of the state for June and July with no fishing in August. So collectively the modeled impact for Klamath River fall Chinook for Oregon south of Falcon fisheries is 390 fish, or less than half a percent of the forecasted ocean abundance. So obviously there's always some risk in setting and managing fisheries because of the variability and uncertainty, but to help put things in perspective, last year 163 troll vessels landed a little over 18,000 Chinook in a 130-day season in Oregon with an average catch of less than 10 Chinook per boat date. And in the two-week April KMZ fishery, which is the same one proposed this year, there was less than 10 Chinook landed. And although recent harvest rates for Sacramento, and I should say also, recent harvest rates for Sacramento and Klamath fall Chinook in the Oregon troll fishery have pretty consistently been less than modeled, averaging 35% of pre-season expectations for Sacramento and 84% for Klamath during 18' through 22'. So overall the proposed Oregon south of Falcon fisheries are projected to provide a harvest of nearly 100,000 mostly coho, but also Chinook salmon, with less than 7% being Sacramento fall Chinook. So in a tough year like this, leveraging these impacts will provide a meaningful recreational opportunity and provide public access to fresh ocean salmon via commercial harvest. So in closing, I want to thank the public that participated in this process and recognize the great work of the Salmon Technical Team, Council staff, and my Oregon coworkers

for their assistance over the last several months. I especially appreciate the work of the SAS for their dedication to the process and the time that they devote, and want to acknowledge the cooperation I observed between the Oregon SAS members to resolve some issues. I also want to congratulate Robin on her upcoming retirement. We spent a lot of time together years ago managing Columbia River fisheries and it's well deserved. And finally, I just wanted to voice my appreciation and words to the tribes and co-managers for their words of wisdom that they always offer. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:49] Thank you John. Any questions for clarification on the motion? No questions, discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:12:59] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Consistent with past votes in March on this topic, I will be voting no on the Oregon motion. After a week of taking inventory of needs, risks, costs, benefits, and trade-offs, California is disappointed that Oregon chose to ignore the risks posed by unrestricted summer fishing seasons in northern and central Oregon without quotas or harvest limits. It is great to see that Oregon can offer a good deal of opportunity this year on healthy stocks, but in a year when forecasts of California target stocks that also support Oregon's fisheries are so low, and consequently the harvest models project very low impacts, capping fishery performance to prevent runaway fisheries would seem an easy risk-averse choice. The potential for increased effort in these Oregon fisheries is another consideration, given that vessels who would have no fishing opportunity in California for a third year might be motivated to head north. So with that, I'll be voting no. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:21] Thank you Marci. Further discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:14:33] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:35] Opposed?

**Council** [00:14:36] No.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:39] Abstentions? And let me clarify. I believe I heard no votes from, I'll go in order, Rebecca Lent, Marci Yaremko, Marc Gorelnik, Corey Ridings, was there anyone else? No, so you have those Executive Director Burden? So the motion passes with four no votes. Okay, now we'll move on further south. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:15:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I move the Council adopt for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce the 2025 Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Salmon Management Measures for the area from the Oregon-California border to the U.S.-Mexico border as presented in Agenda Item D.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated April 15th, 2025, including all season descriptions, minimum sizes, requirements, definitions, restrictions, and exceptions.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:07] Thank you. The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:16:12] Yes it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:12] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:16:19] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just want to say the SAS put their all into designing a fishery this year out of nothing but scraps. I want to commend the California SAS's creative thinking and their considerations for designing season alternatives with so many competing interests and needs, conservation, opportunity, enforcement, monitoring among them. The commercial SAS members, George and his group explored every opportunity and turned over every stone to look for ways to find meaningful opportunity this year and ultimately a commercial season didn't work out for 2025. But there is hope that sitting on the sidelines for one more year will improve the chances for more meaningful opportunity in 2026. If the auto correlation factor hadn't had such a substantial impact on the Sac fall forecast, the discussion this year may have been different. That said, the 2024 jack counts are a positive sign and there's even more optimism in some of the preliminary information shared this past week on the 2025 returns of Sacramento spring run. I want to shout out to our sports SAS representatives who showed extreme flexibility working with us to develop the small season opportunities that we will move forward with. Thank you for your willingness as we learn how to monitor very short period fisheries. We appreciate their selection of dates and their recognition that we need time between openers to stop and count and tally our best estimates of catch against our newly established harvest guidelines for recreational fisheries. The handful of days that are planned for the sport fishery this year were designed with an immense amount of caution. We've come in well under the projections of catch and the fishery related impacts to Klamath, Sacramento, and endangered species stocks. I also want to acknowledge the proactive thinking in designing a sports season this year in the fall with a new zone, or at least a zone we haven't used as a zone before between Point Reyes and Point San Pedro, sorry Point Sur, during the fall fisheries this year with hopes of allowing access to Mokelumne stocks that we expect will be abundant this fall. While the season adoption day always comes with a feeling of accomplishment, there is work ahead as we approach June and our first opener. Implementing inseason management and monitoring two-day seasons is completely new to the Ocean Salmon Project and will require significant planning over the next few months to ensure there's adequate catch monitoring and coded-wire tag collection activities in all of our California ports at the same time. So we do appreciate the offers we've heard over the week from the recreational industry leaders to help us with the outreach efforts and we will certainly be in touch on those needs over the coming days. While the opportunities are very limited in 2025, they are a step forward from the total closures that we've experienced in 2023 and 2024. With that said, we're very confident that the multiple layers of management and precaution will result in only the most minimal of fishery impacts, allowing both our target and weak stocks the best chances to increase their abundance levels if the favorable environmental conditions hold. I'd like to turn to some discussion over the week we've had with the STT on the package and the need for perhaps some better transparency in what some of the numbers mean and what they represent. And I just want to acknowledge that I appreciate the exchanges we've had over the week with Dr. O'Farrell on the questions the Council's raised about Klamath River adults, adult spawners, the spawner reduction rate, and the river fishery rollover that's used to correctly calculate the number of fish available for tribal harvest under 50-50 sharing. I understand the responses that we received through the number of iterations in the package and I understand there aren't any quick answers right now, but would just flag a need for better clarity and transparency in the package. Interested parties are now scouring the fine print in the documents and are asking very reasonable questions about the meaning of the numbers and how they relate to the ocean abundance forecast. Table A3 of the STT Report shows the projected age 4 ocean harvest rate, but the age 4 constraint for coastal

Chinook wasn't limiting this year. So perhaps it would be more beneficial to show the projected harvest rate on all Klamath adults instead of or in addition to the age 4 ocean harvest rate. I appreciate the willingness of the STT to give these issues regarding the numbers in the package some thought over summer. And if that thinking suggests that a methods review is warranted on either the Klamath ocean harvest model and or the Klamath Forecast in order to bring better resolution, I'd encourage the STT to consider adding an item to the final methods review list that we will take up in September. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:10] Thank you Marci. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:23:24] Thank you Vice. Thank you Miss Yaremko for this motion. I will be voting no on this motion and I wanted to share some of those reasons here. Some of our predicted returns on the Sac are even lower than last year, yet we had higher guidance from NMFS for reasons that remain unclear. When that guidance came out in March there were a lot of questions about why that had changed and what direction that was coming from, and to date I have not gotten a clear answer around that. The logic behind this year and last year's recommendation, they don't make sense to me. That we used a lower target in response to an even lower prediction remains a mystery and a major concern. I want to start right now and express my deep appreciation of the measures that CDF&W have taken and have offered to take as part of this deliberation to do inseason monitoring and quota-based management. That is new. Those are potentially extremely valuable tools, especially when we are at lower levels of abundance. I am very grateful to everyone in the department who took the time and energy and resources to think those things out and bring those tools to the table. Part of that was thinking about a data plan. You know what could those tools get us? What data, what information could a small limited fishery provide us? We've heard some discussion about that. I haven't however seen a data plan or a methodology about how that is going to be executed. Have concerns about limited resource and the ability to effectively execute that plan in a way that means we would be guaranteed to get meaningful data moving forward. The Yurok and Hoopa tribes depend on salmon. While this package provides its treaty obligated 50-50 share of available fish, it does not address the overarching fact that the federal government, across its agencies that go beyond NMFS and NOAA, continues to not meet their obligations. 50-50 of very little is even less. We just heard about minimal needs from the STT which were not even addressed, but that is not even really what I think we should be doing here. We should be focusing on meeting needs. Regarding the recreational opportunities that Miss Yaremko has proposed here, it is my opinion that I do not think having a two-day opener will keep us within our limits. The design of the season put forward by CDF&W, with a lot of help from the SAS, is thoughtful and seeks to address the potential to overfish, but I have longstanding concerns that we will go through our limits in a single two-day season. I've joked that every bloke and her dog will want to fish for salmon, myself included. I think that remains true. We have a lot of folks in California who want to go fish who are going to be there that day one. I'm probably going to one of them. I have a lot of concerns that we are not in a place to be able to manage that. We have heard enforcement concerns about what that looks like and the ability to enforce even a two-day season. There are data and monitoring concerns about how you collect and ensure that that data is useful and rigorous and valid. We heard this week that there are safety concerns for the people who will be fishing. I'm not here to tell people what they can and can't personally risk, but it matters if we set people up for safety or not and that is National Standard 10 demands that of us. We've heard throughout this process from some folks from ports and counties. I want to say I really appreciate them coming and providing that perspective. I think it's helpful and it's nice to hear sort

of what impacts and what fishing means from their perspective. It made me think about what would this even a small season mean for these ports and these communities? And I suspect that it probably would help them. I maintain one weekend at the potential costs that may be paid later down the road in loss of fishing isn't worth the risk. The ocean harvest models, while the good science is developed and run by talented and devoted scientists, have a lot of uncertainty in them. We know that their accuracy is poor and continue to trend towards overestimation, which gives the Council and decision-makers like us very low confidence. Fundamentally, I feel like we are at the margins and we are grasping for straws. Fundamentally the situation is fewer fish than last year when this Council decided to not have a season, so I've been thinking what's the difference? Seems like we have politics. We have desperation. We have sadness. We have frustration, and a lot of that is with folks and entities outside of this Council, which is to say with NMFS and for the state of California for not managing the water necessary for abundant and healthy salmon Those are not reasons, though, to put recovery in future fishing and risk putting Sac fall into an overfished situation, which we were told we missed by a very small margin last year at risk. There remains concerns about spring and winter run as well. Because of the rolling average, the risk of hitting an over-fished declaration on Sac fall is slightly lower this year on paper, but in principle, saving now while we're at the bottom for the future of fishing, that remains. Regarding the Klamath, we have a lot of hope for the future. I know I certainly do with the dams that have come down, but those benefits have not materialized yet and we don't know when they will. We cannot fully change the future for salmon until things are done better on land. And I thank and urge this Council to do everything we can to weigh-in on those issues whenever we can, however it doesn't change our responsibility and authorities here today. And fundamentally this Council is just an advisory body to the National Marine Fisheries Service, and I urge them they must be stronger when working with our state and federal partners to stand up for salmon. Lastly, one issue I've been considering has been fairness. We are asked to consider this under the National Standards as well. While thinking on that, I came to the conclusion that I cannot compliment the fishermen and industry folks enough at what great lengths they've gone to to support each other at this meeting and try to provide fishing opportunity across the board. I'm still struggling with some concerns around fairness however. Asking the commercial fleet to stay tied up while we have recreational is very difficult, even if it's a small opportunity. Again, I want to thank so many people who have been at this meeting around the table and informing this meeting, especially Mr. North and Miss Yaremko, the SAS, the STT, and everyone who was here providing advice on how to move forward with this. I feel very fortunate to be receiving the information, the wisdom, the knowledge from people who put into this, a lot of them on their own time and their own dime, to try to make these decisions as best we can. Thanks.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:40] Thank you Corey. Further discussion? Seeing none I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:31:52] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:53] Opposed?

**Corey Ridings** [00:31:58] No.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:59] Abstentions? The motion passes with one no vote. I believe the Executive Director has that recorded. Thank you. And David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:32:18] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I do have a motion if we can get that up. Yeah, I believe right at the end there where it says, "coho quota", that it should be, "if are taken",

I believe is what that should say, "if the quotas are taken". Correct. Thank you. I move to adopt the Treaty Troll Fisheries Management Measures for submission to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce for the area north of Cape Falcon as shown in Agenda Item D.8.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, Table 3, April 15th, 2025 and the following edit. July 1 through the earlier of the date in September to be established in tribal regulations or 22,500 Chinook quota or the 37,500 coho quota are taken.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:33:39] Thanks Dave. Before I look for a second I just want to make sure the wording might....I think earlier you said something about the word, "if". Do we need that for clarity between the "or" and the "22,500"? And I don't want to change your motion but I just want to make sure it's clear.

**David Sones** [00:34:05] It looks clear, yeah. Regulations or the 22,500 Chinook quota or the 37,500. I think, yeah that looks right.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:34:17] Okay. Thank you and I just think we got to the point that the language on the screen is accurate and complete. So is there a second to it? Seconded by Kyle Adicks. Please speak to your motion.

**David Sones** [00:34:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. This week has been probably one of the most difficult ones I believe we've had from the inside all the way out. It's been very contentious and people have worked through the issues. It's been very difficult. And we got to this point with the treaty ocean troll agreeing on the numbers and meeting our conservation and management obligations. We have the September date is open. Tribal regulations will fill that out also and I think that needs to be addressed in the report where it says again, oh yes, where the quotas include catches by the Klallam, Makah, Washington State, May 1 through the earlier of September it should say. So I think we'll get that in there through this motion. It has the 15th from the older stuff in there. But like I said, it's been a very difficult struggle to get to this point and get to an area where we can actually have a vote and not have to abstain for myself, which I would if we had two different closing dates, then we have two different versions of what the tribes want. And by agreement, when we have those situations I would abstain, but in this case because we just have September outlaid to the end of the management period that is in the FMP, that I would be able to vote on this motion. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:34] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Kyle Adicks.

**Kyle Adicks** [00:36:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'll just reiterate what I said during speaking to my motion that although I altered the closure dates for the non-treaty fisheries north of Cape Falcon, I support fishing through the end of September and intend to support this motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:04] Thank you. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:37:05] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I actually would like to ask a question of NMFS. I'm assuming because we do have the overlay already of the FMP that allows through end of September, that allowing then a closure date that is established in the tribal regulations still meets the needs for clarity and transparency in the motion that is submitted to Secretary of Commerce?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:37:38] Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:37:40] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss Kiefer for the questions. Yes, it does. It puts into back to the tribes what is in their right to do in terms of controlling their fisheries. The September fisheries are managed as a block. All of the impacts are accounted for. Both tribes yesterday, the testimony that we've heard over the last several days, have been common in that they have both included fishing through September. The flavor of that fishing, if you will, varies. So some, in one case, the proposal would have that in late September be the test fishery. In the other case it would be potentially an extension of commercial fishing. All of those impacts are taken into account, and in doing that all of the conservation objectives are met. The Magnuson-Stevens requirements are met and the ESA requirements are met, and so we would have no objection.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:38:44] Thank you for that clarity to both of you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:48] All right, thank you. Further discussion? Or excuse me, questions on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Susan Bishop.

**Susan Bishop** [00:39:01] Not any real discussion, only my gratitude to all the work that's gone into this. This has not been an easy decision. There's been a huge amount of conversation in the background. I know how difficult it was for the tribes to come to the Council and provide their different viewpoints. And I want to extend my appreciation to all of the tribal leadership and the tribal staff and technical people. And in addition to the agencies around them that helped facilitate this, it helped me understand the circumstances better. So I just wanted to present our appreciation.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:42] Thank you. Any other discussion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:39:49] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:51] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you David. so there are a couple of wrap-up things we need to take care of before, I just want to make sure we've completed this part of the final action. I'm not seeing any hands there. Like the others, I want to express my gratitude to everybody who's worked on this through a difficult two months I guess. I think we started off in March. I'm not sure who had said it, whether it was me or somebody else, but because of the nature of the poor salmon returns, the staffing, and everything that was....our support we had that we asked for some patience, understanding, and flexibility as we work through this and everybody has demonstrated that. It's very difficult and I guess I just hope everybody shares my optimism that the reason we keep doing this through these hard times is we want to be at this table when we can pass some robust fisheries up and down the coast for the tribal and non-tribal needs out there and the inriver also, so just stick with it and keep doing good work.

## **E. Habitat Issues**

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

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right. All right, that takes us to our task, which is Consider Comments and Recommendations Developed by the HC. All right, so I'll open the floor for discussion. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:17] Thanks Chair. I just want to thank the Habitat Committee for the report and looking at the section on regarding the Klamath River and the Bureau of Reclamation, just noting that there appears to be moving forward with the Endangered Species Act and Tribal Trust responsibilities and there's a review. And so the Habitat Committee has offered to follow that and keep us abreast and I just wanted to note I appreciate that, have some concerns with that and as that moves forward look forward to getting the update.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:53] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? All right. Kerry.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:00:59] If there's no further discussion or guidance then that concludes your business for this agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:05] All right. Well, that concludes my time at the gavel here too so fantastic. So with that I'll pass the gavel to Vice-Chair Hassemer.



## F. Pacific Halibut Management

### 1. Incidental Catch Limits for the 2025 Salmon Troll Fishery – Final Action

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Goose egg again. With that I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:09] Thank you Chair. While we don't have anybody giving oral public comment, I do you want to acknowledge that there is a written public comment by Mr. Paavo Carroll, who I believe fishes in both California and Oregon, who tried to provide some context to this fishery, how and why it was created and how it's used. So I just wanted to thank Mr. Carroll for that report and the information that was provided.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:36] Okay, very good. All right, I'm not seeing any hands. I'm looking for a motion if that's possible? Somebody? Heather? Heather is your hand up? Heather you there? Oh, I see a hand. I'm sorry, there's a blue hand. Ah, the blue hand. All right, Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:01:08] Hi Chair Pettinger, it's Heather. I think I was just unmuted. My hand is up.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:26] Okay, thank you.

**Heather Hall** [00:01:26] Can you hear me?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:26] Go ahead.

**Heather Hall** [00:01:26] Yeah, thanks. I did just.....I do have a motion on this and I wanted to appreciate the SAS work and thoughtful consideration of the landing limit along with the ratio that they think they need for this year. I think doing that is difficult. It's an incidental retention so not having certainty on the number of boats that will be participating and having, and how much Chinook will be allowed, I think they do a pretty good job of trying to make those things line up so that the trip limits can accommodate that incidental catch. So just appreciating that work that they've done. If there are no other hands up or discussion I could put forward the motion as long as the tower of power has that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:34] I think we're there actually. Okay, so please.

**Heather Hall** [00:02:42] I move the Council adopt the Option 1, Status Quo Catch Limit for the 2025 salmon fishery as described in Supplemental Salmon Advisory Subpanel Report 1 under Agenda Item F.1.a, April 2025. Option 1: Status Quo. Open May 16th, 2025 through the end of the 2025 salmon troll fishery. And beginning April 1, 2026 until modified through inseason action or superseded by the 2026 management measures. License holders may land no more than one Pacific halibut per two Chinook, except one Pacific halibut may be landed without meeting the ratio requirement and no more that 35 halibut landed per trip.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:37] Okay, thank you Heather. Is the language on the screen accurate as it appears to be?

**Heather Hall** [00:03:42] Yes it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:43] Very good, okay, looking for a second? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Thank you Lynn. Okay, please speak to your motion as needed.

**Heather Hall** [00:03:51] Thank you. And again, I think the SAS did a good job of recommending a range of alternatives for public review, and then considering new information that they had when recommending the status quo option. I think the way the Catch Sharing Plan reserves a small portion of the 2A TAC for incidental retention is used fairly well. When you look at the table in Attachment 1, I think 16 out of 21 years attainment has been very close to that allocation. I think there's a few years where that attainment is a bit lower. I think I have considered that maybe more related to the challenging salmon seasons that we've had on the West Coast, and so this seems, Option 1 Status Quo seems like an appropriate ratio and landing limit for this upcoming year.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:15] Okay, thank you Heather. Okay, questions on the motion maker, or questions for the motion maker? Okay, discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:05:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. I will be supporting the motion. I appreciate the SAS's deliberation on this and the thoughtful exchange I just had there with Ryan and the reality that, yeah, there may be more salmon trollers moving up to fish for salmon opportunities in the north because the southern areas are going to be heavily constrained. I do, however, want to just, I guess, remind that this is an incidental fishery and we have had a chance to do a little bit of looking as to the number of participants in this particular fishery. We know the number of permits that's been widely published in this attachment that we've seen year over year, but the actual number of participants kind of has been mysterious, but we did get that answer earlier this week and it's really not all that many, but I recognize that it's an important opportunity that salmon trollers can take advantage of. I'm also looking at the proposed rule on halibut that just published earlier this week and just want to highlight that the average number of, or I'm sorry, the commercial landing limits that are proposed for the 2025 directed fishery, limits for vessels that are up to 35 feet, a maximum catch of 2,000 pounds in that 50-hour trip. Thinking about that as a directed fishery that's fairly low level, but that fish is available for only that 50-hour, 58-hour directed fishery. If you think about the number of halibut that might be spread across the incidental fishery, you know, that season lasts a long time and catch trip limits where they're attaining numbers that are high in the thirties like that, again we I think want to think about what the directed fishery is limited to when we're thinking about incidental limits in the salmon fishery, recognizing that one is a very short period duration and the salmon fishery lasts for a very long time, in many cases over several weeks. So anyway, long story short, I support the recommendation this year. I do want to continue to keep an eye on attainment in this sector of the halibut fishery. We have been talking about ways to improve our utilization of the Area 2A TAC, and this is one area that we might look to as discussions proceed later this fall under the Catch Sharing Plan agenda item. But I appreciate the exchange here with Ryan and his expectation that this series of incidental requirements should improve attainment in the salmon troll sector for 2025. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:27] Okay, thank you Marci. Anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:31] Thank you Chair. I too am supportive and appreciate the SAS taking a hard look at what they thought would be happening. And I think as everybody around this table

knows, the last few years salmon fishing opportunities off of Oregon have not been that great, and with low salmon limits means low halibut allowances. Prior to, or since 2020, the poundage of halibut that's been landed off of salmon troll fisheries into Oregon has been 1,500 pounds or less per year. Prior to 2019, it was above 8,500 to 10,000 pounds. So it goes hand-in-hand with the salmon opportunities. And given where we are with our salmon fisheries, allowing a little bit of additional opportunity, even if it's two or three fish, at five, six dollars a pound for halibut, that could be 500 dollars, 600 dollars added to that trip which maybe that covers food, maybe it covers bait. It just hopefully helps make that fishery a little more economical. So I appreciate the discussions we're having and the tough discussion and look that the SAS had. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:44] Okay, thank you Lynn. Anyone else? All right, not seeing any hands I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:10:58] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:58] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. All right, Angela how we doing?

**Angela Forristall** [00:11:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. You have adopted final landing restrictions for Pacific halibut. These will be incorporated into the Table 1 salmon troll options that you will be seeing throughout the course of the rest of the week. And with that, your work is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:30] Okay, very good. Thank you. And with that, we're going to take a short break.

## **G. Coastal Pelagic Species Management**

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

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes our reports, comments, takes us to Council action, which is discussion only, no action items here. I will look around and see if there's anything that needs to be discussed. Had the updates. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:00:22] Thanks. No updates. I just was going to repeat what I said earlier about I think this is a nice opening way of thinking about what we're going to discuss tomorrow under G.5. And as Jeff's testimony, it brought that up again so looking forward to tomorrow.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:45] Thank you. Anything else? Not seeing anything, Katrina, that finishes our work here?

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:00:51] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This is a good discussion and that completes your work on this item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:57] All right, thank you.

## 2. Exempted Fishing Permits (EFP) for 2025-26 – Final Action

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes our reports, public comment, and takes us to our Council action, which is to adopt any final EFP recommendations for the 2025-26 fisheries. I'll look for anyone to initiate the discussion here. No discussion? No action? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:00:35] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Sorry I'm slow on the draw. I think we've seen the evidence that this is information that's useful for the science, the scientists have attested to that. And this is an ongoing collection, it's good to keep it going and assurances to keep it underneath the catch allowance. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:58] Thank you. Briana Brady, did you have your hand up?

**Briana Brady** [00:01:01] Thanks. I was just going to express support for the EFPs. I don't have a motion but could state one if needed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:15] Sorry, can you repeat that? We were....

**Briana Brady** [00:01:19] Oh yeah, I just said I support the EFP and I don't have a motion but could state one right now if needed.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:38] Yes, thank you. We're just confirming we do need a motion on this to move those forward if that's the desire of the Council to move them forward.

**Briana Brady** [00:01:51] Thank you. I move the Council approve Agenda Item G.2, Attachment 1, CWPA EFP for the 2025-2026 season.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:29] All right, on the screen it looks like they've captured your motion completely and accurately. I'll let you read it over to make sure.

**Briana Brady** [00:02:41] Yep.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:41] It's good? Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Please speak to your motion.

**Briana Brady** [00:02:46] Thank you. As stated, this EFP provides biological data to help inform the stock assessment, and I think it's valuable to keep it moving forward.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:59] All right, thank you. Any questions for clarification on this motion? No questions, discussion on the motion? No discussion then, I will call the question. All those in favor in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:03:17] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:19] Opposed? Abstentions?

**Josh Lindsay** [00:03:26] Abstain.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:26] The motion passes with an abstention from National Marine Fisheries Service. Thank you Briana. With that, I'm not going to drag this on too much. Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:03:38] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. The Council has adopted the final EFP recommendations for the 2025 to 2026 fisheries and has completed their business for this agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:51] All right, I'll scan the room once more, see if there are any last words. Not seeing any, we'll close out this agenda item.

### 3. Pacific Sardine Assessment, Harvest Specifications, and Management Measures for 2025-26 – Final Action

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right, well that takes care of public comment and takes us to Council discussion and action. So I'm kind of curious if you want to take a break before we do that, come back, or is it.....Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:00:17] Thank you Chair. I was going to raise a question for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:21] Sure.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:00:21] Can I just do that quickly? Thank you. Just going back to Dr. Yao's presentation and I was too shy, believe it or not, to ask the question, but now I'm going to ask it. On her slide number 5, Dr. Yao discussed the preliminary results suggest that the following factors may be important for recruitment, and there's four there. I can read them. Timing of upwelling season, local spawning habitat, zooplankton forage, and ocean currents in the Southern California bight. So it's a naive question, but is there anything in this list that we could impact other than our overall impact as human beings on this planet? We've been talking so much about salmon habitat and water temperatures and so forth in water supply, is there anything we can change here? Thank you, and sorry for putting you on the spot.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:24] Okay, Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:01:24] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for the question Dr. Lent. Was that something you were hoping I would answer, or would you like me to see if Dr. Yao's still in the ether? I mean I could offer, looking at the list I am not aware of beyond how you describe sort of what we'd be able to control here, and I think we're still trying to get a better handle on even those processes, and that's, I think, the goal of the work that's happening at the moment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:55] Okay, thank you Rebecca. All right, anybody else? Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:02:03] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to provide the Council with one correction from the CPSMT Report which is now posted in a Revised Supplemental CPSMT Report under Agenda Item G.3. There was a small transcription error in the report for one of the mentions of the OFL number. The corrected number is 4,645 metric tons, which is the number that is referenced in Table 1. There was just, in the narrative text, one instance where it was 4,465. But that has, again, been corrected to 4,645 metric tons. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:52] Thank you. All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:52] Thanks Chair. This is a question for NMFS, so I think for Mr. Lindsay, that was brought up during the questions we had with the management team. And I think Mr. Niles asked about what happens if the ACL is exceeded and what that means for other fisheries. And there was some discussion around the hake fishery, some discussion around whether that would be waste, and I'm wondering if NMFS would be willing to add a little bit more to that? If there's some thoughts on what exactly happens if we are to exceed that ACL?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:30] Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:03:35] Through the Chair, thank you for the question Miss Ridings. I guess I'll lead my answer with I don't have an expectation of us exceeding the ACL. I think we do a pretty good job. We have pretty good catch reporting. And so it would be, you know, there is a potential of us hitting that ACL and triggering sort of a scenario where retention would likely be prohibited. So yes, we don't shut down these fisheries, but fisheries would have to discard or in terms of some of the CPS fisheries target cleaner schools than maybe they would pre-hitting the ACL, if that helps answer the question.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:25] Thanks Corey. All right. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:04:25] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I'm trying to stop myself. I agree with Josh that the ACL would not likely be reached. And I really wish we'd get to the point where we also realize that we're counting too many fish against that at this point and I don't understand why we're still doing that. But in the whiting fishery if you can't find 10 sardine, and Brad can tell you it's just not logistically possible, and Aja can speak to that, but hopefully we never have to talk about that but I just don't.....It's a theoretical point at this point and I'll leave it there. There would be practicalities to that, it just wouldn't be workable.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:11] Okay, thanks Corey. All right. So Briana. All right, do we want to take a short break before we go to.....does that sound good? Been at it for a little bit here so let's just take a 10-minute break, make sure we're good and then we'll get to it. Come back at 11.....(BREAK).... All right, welcome back. We're towards the end of G.3 and I'll open the floor for discussion or motions. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:05:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:01] Wonderful. Please.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:06:11] Thank you Chair. I move for the 2025-2026 northern subpopulation of Pacific sardine we adopt the following specifications. Biomass equals 30,158 metric tons, OFL 4,645 metric tons. P Star of 0.5, ABC Tier 2, 3,957. ACL of 2,200 metric tons and an ACT of 2,100 metric tons. Also move that we adopt the following accountability measures. Incidental landings limit in CPS fisheries of 20%. If the ACT of 2,100 is attained, a per trip limit of 1 metric tons of Pacific sardine applies to all CPS fisheries. And an incidental per landing allowance of 2 metric tons of Pacific sardine in non-CPS fisheries until the ACL is reached. The specifications accommodate the EFP apportionment of 520 metric tons. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:20] All right, thank you Rebecca. Is the language on the screen accurate? It appeared to be.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:07:28] Thank you Chair. There's one typo. Yeah, that's accurate. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:31] Okay, very good. Second? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Thank you Sharon. Please speak to your motion Rebecca.



**Rebecca Lent** [00:07:40] Thank you Chair. So the biomass estimate is below the MSST of 50,000 metric tons. The CPS FMP does allow incidental landing limit to range up to 20% when the stock is below the MSST. I'm just recalling that the Council adopted the Revised Pacific Sardine Rebuilding Plan in November of 2024 and the adopted biomass for which when the adopted biomass is below 50,00 metric tons we recommend 2,200 metric ton ACL. There is a P Star of 0.45 to address the scientific uncertainty and lower the risk of exceeding the OFL. The ability to monitor landings and to not exceed the ACL is why the ACT can be so close to the ACL in this instance. The risk of the exceeding of the OFL is very low, we just heard that from our colleague from the National Marine Fisheries Service, as landings have averaged less than the 2,200 metric tons since the directed fishery was closed in 2015-2016. We have daily data collection which facilitates the monitoring of landings as they approach the ACL so management can respond quickly resulting in a very low risk of exceeding the ACL. There's accountability measures to allow flexibility for fisheries that rely on Pacific sardines and an acceptable low risk of exceeding the ACL. I'll also note that the ACL recommendation is consistent with the Council's recommendation for the Revised Sardine Rebuilding Plan. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:15] Okay, thank you. Okay, questions for the motion maker? All right, discussion on the motion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:09:26] Thanks Chair. Thanks Dr. Lent for this motion. I plan to vote for this motion, but I did want to air a couple thoughts for discussion regarding the difference between the ACL and the ACT. This motion follows the advice of the advisory panel, but does not follow the advice of the management team. As we heard in questions when I asked Mr. Krutzikowsky about that difference, we heard that 200 metric tons wasn't very much and that the management team was not comfortable with less than a 200 metric ton buffer. I understand that this motion, and like I said I'll be voting for it because we also heard from Mr. Everingham about the flexibility, and we heard from the advisory panel about what that flexibility and what that looks like and what that could mean. And then in the overall scope of this fishery, I think it's worth proceeding with this ACT but did want to give note to the management team's concerns and just underscore what we heard from the National Marine Fisheries Service, what we have heard from others about the monitoring, the communication, and being really thoughtful that we do not exceed these limits and these numbers and targets. Generally, these numbers are really low and that's painful for everyone in a number of ways. And it's also what we've talked about extensively under this and we will talk about more later in our agenda tomorrow about sort of the overarching conditions regarding the way the stock is defined. So optimistically, I hope that we're going to get to that and make some changes soon. In the meantime what we have what we have in front of us so was happy to hear that we do have that monitoring in place and that we will be careful about how we approach these numbers and look forward to hopefully some longer term solutions soon.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:36] Thank you Corey. All right, David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:11:39] I just want to support everything that she said. Pulled the words right out of my mouth so I will be voting for it, but I have a little concern with the 2,100. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:55] Thank you David. Anyone else? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:11:57] Yeah, thanks. Thanks Rebecca for the motion and Dave and Corey's. I think...I don't think there's a reason to change. I have small things like I don't think we should be changing P star to .45. I think the reasoning has all been mixed up but I think we can fix that with

the larger issues in prioritizing those starting tomorrow. But yeah, if it were me we should stick to P Star of .4. And it's not about keeping, it's not about keeping your actual catch below the OFL, it's about a risk tolerance of whether you think your OFL is being estimated properly. But it's a theoretical matter of principle and not pragmatic at this point so I can support the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:51] Thank you Corey. All right, Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:12:51] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And yeah, I just wanted to second Corey's discussion of the interpretation of P Star in this case, but agree with everything Miss Ridings raised earlier and so I plan to support the motion as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:05] Thank you Aja. All right. Anyone else? Not seeing anybody. Oh, Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:13:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks Rebecca for the motion. I will be abstaining from voting on this motion since the revised rebuilding plan is not yet approved. I'd note that our original management for sardine was thoughtfully created based on past lessons learned and it had the foresight to already include implicit rebuilding while reminding everyone that our directed fishery has been closed for 10 years now. Additionally, I agree with MT and AS in setting the P Star equal to .45. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:46] Okay, thank you Briana. All right, I'm not seeing any more hands. And with that I'm going to call for the question, so all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:13:59] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:00] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Briana Brady** [00:14:01] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:04] Thank you. All right, the motion passes with one abstention. So very good, thank you. All right. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:14:15] Yeah, thanks. Maybe just a question for staff about maybe this could be a G.5 issue or maybe it fits here, but we had on this matter of the catch accounting against the ACL and what proportion is northern. In my question I brought up the prospect of doing a projection model and I think and Mark on the AS called it a rule of thumb type approach, which I think you can get more quantitative than that, but I think it is something we could task the team with working on as soon as possible. Having done this with the Groundfish Management Team for a long time I think it would be a decent amount of work but doable. And so I don't know if staff had any, Merrick or Katrina had any thoughts about where the right place to consider that task would be?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:14] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:15:16] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and appreciate the question Mr. Niles. I'll ask, invite Katrina to weigh-in if she has anything, any corrections as as I think about what we could do here. I just want to make sure I'm understanding your question. So what I think you're asking Mr. Niles is related to how do we track catch with respect to the northern subpopulation versus southern subpopulation? Right now we assume that all the catch in the season

is attributed to the northern subpopulation. Is that a fair characterization of where you're coming from?

**Corey Niles** [00:15:52] Exactly, yeah.

**Merrick Burden** [00:15:55] So I think we heard a couple of things as part of this agenda item and so what I would be.....what's going through my head is that you could ask the management team to come up with a, I would say a realistic probably precautionary rule of thumb, and come back tomorrow with that. We would leave this agenda item open. You could then consider that number and whether you think it's worthwhile or responsible to use that for purposes of your catch tracking this year, and then maybe a longer term investigation as part of G.5, which is the science, needs, and priorities item. So if I'm continuing to speak appropriately to your question, I think there's two things you can do. One would be to task the MT to come back tomorrow with something. The second one would be to take up a more in-depth investigation under G.5.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:02] Okay. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:17:02] Yeah, I think I'd be a little hesitant to ask for the team to do something for tomorrow. I think they still have G.5 left to discuss and half the day is going to be gone by the time they get back to the room. But maybe there's a, I can't remember when they next meet, but. So now I'm talking maybe it would be a better discussion for G.5 and we can, maybe there's a possibility they could bring it in November, if I'm remembering that's the next time they come back, but I'd be a little, yeah, I don't want to throw more work at them when they have plans for their afternoon already.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:43] Okay, thanks Corey. Maybe we could ask the team maybe for what their thoughts are on that if it's possible. So, I guess it would be, Greg could you come up to the table please?

**Greg Krutzikowsky** [00:17:55] (off mic) I can, but you might want the Chair to.....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:55] Oh, Chair? Okay, did you hear Executive Director's Burden's question?

**Kirk Lynn** [00:18:28] I heard some of it, to come back tomorrow with a proposed plan for catch accounting, is that correct?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:37] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:18:41] Thank you. I think we are exploring ideas here. So I'm trying to respond to Mr. Niles' question. And the possibility that was going through my head is whether the MT could come up with a rule of thumb. So if you look say back across the last few years, how much of the catch has come from the northern subpopulation and could you assume the worst and say it's 50 or it's 70% and feel like using that for purposes of tracking catch through this year would be a responsible thing to do, and then bring that back to the Council for the Council's consideration tomorrow morning. And I believe Mr. Niles was expressing his well reasoned concern about your workload and your ability to do that on top of the G.5 statement that we're looking for from you as well.

**Kirk Lynn** [00:19:42] Correct. Thank you Mr. Burden. And I appreciate the question and the concern Mr. Niles. Yeah, we do have work to do on G.5, that's for sure, but I think we can come back with something that as Mr. Burden had described by tomorrow.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:04] Okay, cool. Okay, thanks Kirk.

**Kirk Lynn** [00:20:09] Yep.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:10] You bet. All right, further discussion on this or should I turn to Katrina like this, Katrina, how we doing?

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:20:17] Thank you Mr. Chair, the Council has adopted an overfishing limit and biomass estimate as well as adopted a P Star, ABC, ACL, and ACT, and other management measures and adopted an incidental catch allowance for CPS and non-CPS fisheries. We'll keep this agenda item open it sounds like until the management team can come back with those, the analysis that was requested.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:44] Okay, there you go. All right, with that, Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:20:50] Thanks Mr. Chair, and sorry to be a little slow on the draw here. A quick question around if we were to get this report around catch accounting today and reconsider it tomorrow, I'm not sure who this question is for but just thinking about let's say we were able to get that together and have that done next year, where in our management does that fit in in terms of being able to take action on it? My brain's a little slow in terms of thinking about how we move through our CPS management structure, but just trying to think about where that information would be used in our management cycle? Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:34] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:21:37] Thank you. I find myself also looking over to Mr. Lindsay, but I'm sure Mr. Lindsay will weigh-in if I really botch this question. But what occurs to me is that where this would be used is throughout the course of a season as we see catch coming through and we're counting that toward an ACL, we would be using this fraction, or whatever it may be, to help with that tracking to help inform how close we are getting to the ACL. So it's a within season estimation tool, if you will. Is that answering your question? And I'll look at Mr. Lindsay to see if he has a different perspective on how this might be used?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:28] Corey. Oh, Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:22:28] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think I also understand the theoretical concept, but Miss Ridings actually asked the exact same questions I was about to pose. So I understand the desire to explore this as something as a potential tool in the future, and I could see that discussion happening under G.5. I think I am struggling with the connection under this agenda item and if, and I think it's a big if, and how we would ultimately implement that, particularly for the next fishing season. And so I think that'd warrant a bit more discussion on our end and maybe a broader discussion around this table of how we would do that given that the management is not sort of designed to accommodate that at the moment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:21] Briana.

**Briana Brady** [00:23:21] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, I guess I would....first of all I'm not clear if someone said fraction of catch and how that would work, but you start talking fractions and I start thinking LED, Law Enforcement Division, so something more simple would be better. And then also back to Mr. Lindsay, would a rule have to be implemented to account for how the catch would be tracked? Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:02] Okay, well that's why we're holding this open until tomorrow. So probably....Corey?

**Corey Ridings** [00:24:09] Thanks Mr. Chair, I'm going to add one more thing. I understand you're looking maybe to hold this and I get this, but responding a little bit to Director Burden's comment, if we're tracking this to see how close we are in terms of a proportion for the northern versus southern, and we're thinking about that in terms of the ACL, but our current stock definition is only around the northern, and so that doesn't really give us any mechanism to change anything. So I think that that information is very useful and is something I think we do have actually. In retrospect, from what I understand, that's something that we have at the end of the year. But in terms of real-time catch accounting, doing that science, and bringing that information even into management, it would be my understanding at this moment that there's really nothing we could do about it under our current stock structure. So maybe that's a question for Director Burden or someone else if they'd like to kind of clarify me or correct me on that understanding.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:15] Corey Niles has his hand up, so Corey we'll go to you first.

**Corey Niles** [00:25:20] Yeah, I think....well yeah, I didn't mean to cause this, the discussion would be G.5. But this is really just, I can't, if in groundfish you have a mismatch between the, as Will said, your stock unit that they're assessing and is being rebuilt, and then what you're accounting against that and, like an analogy in groundfish, I can't think of a recent example, but if we have a stock complex that has like ten different species in it and we want to track it, you make a projection about what your landings, what the composition, the proportion of each species is going to be landed and the discards is a very small....so it's not a rulemaking thing. It's rational analysis of what, how much of your catch is the stock that you are caring about. So it is a bit perplexing how we've gone this many years without doing that. And we have, I've been around long enough to know that salmon does the same kind of thing of you're trying to predict which stock in the ocean is going to be whatever run you're worrying about and you're making projections about that using a quantitative method. So yeah, I didn't mean to launch into it right now, but it is a very normal thing to do in other FMPs. And it's actually really abnormal to make the really irrational assumption that what your data is showing. I don't think there's been a year, if you look, that's been 100% northern substock in the landings. So why, just using normal logic, why would you ever then do that, except I think Rebecca was hinting at it to be really precautionary, and we have precaution on precaution on a precaution here with our ACT and then this P Star that....But anyway so that's, I just don't understand....from my perspective what we do now is very odd, and what Merrick is suggesting is more in line with what we do in the other FMPs.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:31] I'll just give you a reference over the last 10 years. The portion of catch of the sardine is for northern stock. It's 4% at its lowest and 48% at its highest and we've averaged 27% of the catch has been northern over the past 10 years on average. So I think what we're asking is for the management team to come back and give us a number that's overly precautionary that

we feel very comfortable with to assign to catch. That's what we're talking about doing here, and I don't think there's....I think it seemed like to me that could certainly be done under this agenda item and I won't see why it's that hard being that we've undershot the number so much and to come back at the end of the year and say, oh yeah, you could have had 10,000 more tons or whatever it was, or 5,000 more tons, it seems kind of just ridiculous to me and this is an easy way to do it. At least we could have them explore it and maybe the number could come back, maybe it's 70%, or 60%, I don't know, but I think it's....they said they can do it, I think we ought to allow them to do it and go from there. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:28:39] Thanks Chair. I didn't mean to imply that this information wouldn't be useful. I completely agree that I think it is and I think its important for the reasons that the Chair just outlined. My concern stems from the tools that we have available to us right now as defined by the FMP, which include the stock definition and the difference between the two populations and we're hearing a lot and I'm in agreement that that's something we're going to address later. Where my concern and why I'm bringing this up now is I, because of our current structure, I don't want to give the industry or other interest holders a potentially false sense of an ability to make changes inseason, or that there will necessarily be a change with our next season based on this information. That is my primary concern. So I think that we can let this live for now unless anybody wants to speak more. I will look forward to seeing what the management team comes up with this afternoon. I just wanted to be knitting those two things together in terms of what information we can get and use based on our current structure and how we can actually apply that data and information in management.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:54] Fair enough. Yep, thanks Corey. Yep, all right. Okay with that, we're going to slide to hold this over until tomorrow.....(BREAK).....That brings us to Council action so I'll open the floor for discussion and Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:16] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm not going to drag this on. I heard a lot of good and interesting things today, or this morning so far. A couple of bullet points. One of them, Mr. Fina has mentioned that this inseason attribution of catch isn't the solution to the problem, don't waste our time on that. That was a good direction forward. That the other piece I'm going to pull up from yesterday when we went through this, there were a number of individuals who mentioned that we're all confident that they're not going to exceed the ACL, and that we're talking about this why should we do something? But not to insult anybody, but I just can't accept that sort of faith-based management when the implications of exceeding it are so great across the West Coast that some type of contingency plan should be in place. And that contingency plan, we just heard from Mark Fina, really made a lot of sense to me that maybe we're not going to get to the point where we need it, but what I would propose maybe to NMFS is if we get to December or some point where they do approach the ACT, there could be a lightning strike. You know the catch that occurs, that if they approach the ACT, then can they do what was proposed here, is run the model and make sure we, as best as possible, attribute the catch of northern subpopulation to the ACT and avoid this situation where we could potentially shut down a lot of West Coast fisheries that could impact sardines. And then we get to April and they run all this and say, uh, well sorry we didn't need to do that because the catch was only 300 metric tons or 1,000 metric tons of northern subpopulation. So in the contingency, in case you need it, we know what we could do. I've heard that it's doable and we come in at that checkpoint, assuming December is the right time, and make sure we're not incorrectly shutting down the fishery. So I guess it's a question to NMFS.

Is that something that's possible without changing what we do? Just this sort of midseason check-in if it's needed and we see we're running into a problem?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:10] All right, thanks Vice-Chair Hassemer. More coffee. All right, anybody else? Josh.

**Josh Lindsay** [00:33:22] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I assume that was a direct question. I think where we stand now today sitting here, I'm hesitant to say whether or not that is a possibility that is practical. I know some folks have said that is doable. I've also heard folks, and we heard from the MT that it's not doable. We have not had a chance to run through both internally within the Region and the Science Center of a defined practical way we would do that inseason at this time. It is something we could be interested in doing and we could explore, but I think I would underscore some of the concerns also raised by Mr. Fina of where and how we utilize resources at this point in time. I will also repeat, and I can appreciate the concern about exceeding the values you recommended yesterday or coming close to them, based on what we've been seeing the last six years that seems unlikely at this point in time. That does not underscore concerns from bait and the recreational industry. These were concerns that I think we had hopefully eyes wide open on. Last November when we were developing the proposed rebuilding plan that was recommended to the agency, I understand that perhaps we did not have the time to have run through all the ins and outs of that given sort of short timeline we had. So maybe I'll stop there. Thank you Mr. Chair, Vice-Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:02] Thank you Josh. All right, Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:35:12] Thanks. What Josh just did in his head is exactly what we should be doing for the likelihood of reaching the ACL. It's the same thing we do with the likelihood of it not being 100% northern substock. But I think the...Pete, the way you described it is exactly how I've been thinking about it in terms of what's the contingency plan needed until we can take up the longer term fix. And so I think I've heard of a couple ideas, but we should, since we're talking about it now, go a little bit longer, but I think it's under the next agenda item, prioritizing workload, you know what is the value of the contingency plan versus the other trade-offs there? But I think there's...Briana hinted at an idea of maybe there's months where you're just 100% sure that it's southern substock. There's simple ways to have this contingency plan in place. I think we can talk about it under the next agenda item of whether we, coming up with that plan is worth the workload cost Josh just reminded us of. But I haven't heard one person say that it makes, that 100%...that agrees with the implied assumption that all of the landings are the northern substock and that we should do this. So I'm pretty frustrated in a not very frustrated way, but no one agrees with that statement and yet we don't want to fix it, but I think that the discussion would best happen when we consider all the other needs in the next agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:54] Okay Corey. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:36:55] Thanks Mr. Chair. And I just wanted to respond to Mr. Lindsay's comments there. I understand the workload, but I really hope that NMFS can think about this and consider it, and as I said, we don't expect them to exceed it, but the table we got this morning from the management team, if I...I'm just going to read through real quick since the management year that started in 2015, the total U.S. Landings, 1,900, 1,885, 1,775, 2,278, 2,062, 2,276, 1,700, 1,600, they're all getting up there. 30% of them in the last 10 years exceeded the 2,000 ton metric, or

2,000 metric ton ACT that we set. So I think there's a reason to be concerned and have this plan in place. And you know I think I heard from the management team that it's something doable. Asked the question, what's the data stream, the satellite imagery? It's going to be done anyway in April or sometime prior to that because we have it at the April meeting. So again, this is protecting a lot of, a lot of West Coast fisheries that could intercept somehow sardines from closure when after the fact we're going to find out it wasn't necessary. So it's not doing anything different, it's just taking a midseason check-in to make sure we're not incorrectly impacting a lot of other fisheries. And so I hope NMFS can really look hard at that and think about the possibility of doing that while we address the bigger issues, the longer term solutions. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:39:01] Okay, thank you. All right, anyone else? I don't see any hands. Okay, Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:39:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. Given that the Council completed the task yesterday, as well as had a discussion on the additional work that was completed by the management team and the additional comments that were provided today, I think your business on this item is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:39:33] All right, thank you.



#### 4. Pacific Mackerel Specifications and Management Measures for 2025-27 - Final Action

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, that takes care of public comment and brings us to Council action, which is before you, our tasks. So I'll open the floor for discussion. Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:00:17] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just wanted to say thank you to Alex Jensen and the STAT for completing a catch-only projection for Pacific mackerel and to the SSC Subcommittee panel for completing the review. I'm sorry, the SSC for completing the review. And I'm supportive of Supplemental Report 1, CPS Supplemental Report 1 and can make a motion when you're ready.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:42] Okay, very good. I'm not seeing any hands so, and it is almost lunchtime so. Those motions get us there quicker so.

**Briana Brady** [00:00:56] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:08] All right. Okay. Please.

**Briana Brady** [00:01:09] Thanks. I feel like the formatting got a little messed up. Things were numbered so I'll just put the numbers in as I go, if that's okay? I move the Council.....I move that the Council approved the Pacific.....Number 1: Approve the Pacific mackerel catch-only projection for U. S. management in 2025-2026 and 2026-2027, April 2025, Agenda Item G.4.a, Supplemental CPSMT Report 1. And then Number 2: Adopt Tables 1 and 2 in Supplemental CPSMT Report 1, April 2025, Agenda Item G.4.a. And then Number 3: if the ACT is met, adopt a 45% incidental landing allowance when Pacific mackerel are landed with other CPS or up to 3 metric tons of Pacific mackerel per landing could be landed in non-CPS fisheries.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:17] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

**Briana Brady** [00:02:18] It is. Thank you for the formatting.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:21] Okay, looking for a second? Seconded by Corey Niles. Thank you Corey. Please speak to your motion Briana.

**Briana Brady** [00:02:28] Thanks. We heard from the SSC that they endorse the mackerel catch-only projection as the best available scientific information for setting management measures.....what?

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:02:36] Sorry to interrupt. Thank you Mr. Chair. We just have one correction to Bullet 1. The Pacific mackerel catch-only projection is Agenda Item G.4, Attachment 1. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:54] Is that what you were doing Corey? Okay. Okay, so Corey wasn't a second. He was trying to get my attention and I blew it. So let's fix that without going through a....(interruption)...yes. All right. Okay, is that right now?

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:03:18] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:19] Alright, that's why you get the big bucks so okay. All right, and now I'll need a second. Seconded by Corey Niles. Thank you. Briana, now speak to your motion. Sorry.

**Briana Brady** [00:03:33] Does number two need to be corrected?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:38] Uh oh.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:03:43] Through the Chair, Tables 1 and 2 are present in Supplemental CPSMT Report 1, which can be described under Number 2 if you'd like.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:04] So we're good?

**Briana Brady** [00:04:05] Thanks. So we heard from the SSC that they endorsed the mackerel catch-only projection as the best available scientific information for setting management measures for the next two seasons. And as far as using a P Star of .45 that was recommended by the CPS Management Team and various members of the CPSAS, it's consistent with the previous Council action. And in terms of the management measures, providing a 45% Incidental catch allowance will allow the fleet to fish other stocks if the ACT is met. And the 3 metric tons also allows non-CPS fisheries to take small amounts of mackerel if the ACT is reached as well. So, thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:43] All right. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:04:49] Okay, thanks Briana. Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Briana for putting this together. Same thing I said earlier about P-Star. I'm respectfully disagreeing. I think it's a principle not pragmatic at this point. And I'm also saying I do agree with many of the points that Geoff made in public testimony about, and hope we can under G.5 talk about better ways, more efficient ways of possibly using the Science Center's workload. But I'm going to vote for, support of the motion of course.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:20] Thank you Corey. All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:05:26] Thanks Chair. I'm going to echo a little bit what Mr. Niles said. I plan to vote for this motion. Reading the SSC Report, certainly the considerations of Tier 2 versus Tier 3 regarding that uncertainty, actually reading through the tables probably most people noted that the numbers actually came out the same. I meant to ask the SSC why and I didn't. I guess I will ask them on the side later. But just understanding that their recommendation is BSIA, so in terms of incorporating scientific uncertainty understand that that is there. I want to note that these on-the-water observations are important and so is understanding these surveys. And I just wanted to voice my appreciation for Oceana paying attention and bringing this to us. I see those concerns as valid and important and good to raise those concerns. I think we've had wider ranging conversations across the Council, across FMPs, about the value of different observations, whether that's coming from data that the conservation public bring forward or what fishermen are seeing on the water as we heard the AS talk about, those all have value, and so I'm grateful that they are brought forward and can be part of the discussion that the AS and the management teams and the Council can have. I wanted to explicitly draw attention to this concept of a framework approach, that and also kind of in conjunction what Mr. Shester, excuse me, Dr. Shester brought up around

the resources required to do sort of this catch-only versus an update, that seems really prudent. And to Mr. Niles's comment, I hope we hear more about that tomorrow. I think that's an appropriate thing to think more about there. Finally, I did want to note regarding P Star, you know there's a reason we have it and there's reason we do that as part of every spex process, and that is that we can change it. And so I just want to say I appreciate the comments that we heard from the AS and Mr. Everingham, but just wanted to also note that I think that there is, you know, when we set that we set that on a shorter term spex basis, which allows us to be flexible and allows us change that over time as the need arises. So I do not agree sort of with the concept of keeping it high or necessarily even keeping it low for long-term purposes when this is really a shorter-term ability that we have a Council to be flexible and make those changes as we see them occurring. So thank you for the motion and I will be voting for it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:11] Okay, thank you Corey. All right, anyone else? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands, that means I'm going to call for the question so. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:08:22] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:23] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. All right, good job. Let's see, anything else? Hands? Katrina, how are we doing?

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:08:39] Thank you Mr. Chair. The Council has adopted the Pacific mackerel catch-only projection, also known as the stock assessment, adopted a P-Star, an ABC, an ACL, and an ACT, and other specifications and management measures, and has adopted an incidental catch allowance for CPS and non-CPS fisheries. So business for this agenda item is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:04] Wonderful, thank you, and great job everyone.

## 5. Science and Management Priorities

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, that finishes our public comment and takes us to Council action. So with that, I'll open the Council floor for discussion. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:14] Thank you Chair. Yeah, I know where I'd like this agenda item to go. What I'd like to see is that we, especially with sardine, move forward right away with doing the process to do a single action to set the right number of stocks in the FMP. I don't really care particularly, like I don't have a dog in the fight about the answer to that number of stocks, but we just have to do it. And we have to do that in a way that's transparent to everyone, and so that lands to me as the highest priority for this list. What strikes me, and I'll leave it here because I think a lot of people have a lot of things to say, but what strikes me here is the parallels between this and some of the comments you heard with the groundfish FMP earlier this week, that there's synergy from different sides of the aisle about the need to move forward very, very quickly with something that cleans up messes that have been there for a long time. And so I think, yeah, we have to stick with those calls to do those things as much as possible. I'll leave it there and let other people speak up. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:33] Thank you Aja. All right, anyone else? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:01:41] Thanks Chair. Agreeing with Miss Szumylo and just sort of reflecting on how much we've heard this week and how much we've heard at previous meetings about the importance of a lot of these items, both for providing opportunity to go fishing as well as conservation needs. So we have a lot in front of us, but I just want to express my gratitude to Council staff and others, and the management teams and advisory bodies for thinking about this and putting this together in a way that's thoughtful. I do have a motion whenever we're ready, but I don't want to cut off conversation here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:27] Okay, thank you Corey. Anyone else? I'm not seeing any hands so maybe that motion might encourage people to raise their hand. So, please.

**Corey Ridings** [00:02:40] Thanks Chair. Thank you tower of power. I move to adopt the list of science and management topics described in G.5, Attachment 1, as modified by Supplemental SSC Report 1. Prioritize the above list for possible Council action. 1. Pacific sardine stock structure. 2. Stock assessment frequency. And 3. Managing annual opportunity.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:14] Thank you Corey. Is the language on the screen accurate? Okay, looking for a second? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Thank you Rebecca. Please speak to your motion Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:03:25] Thanks Chair. As I just described, I think we have a lot of support and a lot of our public asking for a bunch of these items that we just discussed to move forward. Regarding the Pacific sardine stock structure, we very clearly have a problem in that we are not managing the southern stock population and that our fishery does not match our FMP. These issues have been flagged for years. We've heard some discussion about EMSY and distribution, and as part of this my intention is to include consideration of EMSY and distribution as part of the Pacific sardine stock structure potential action. I think we heard the word package used by a couple of

folks, so I'll repeat that here. A package that would address all three of these seems to make the most sense, both conceptually and in terms of sequence. I'll also note that in the SSC noted that distribution also needs to be revisited for anchovy, so that was on the SSC list and would be part of this list as if this motion was adopted. Managing for what we're fishing for is critical. We want to increase fishing opportunity and conservation. I concur with Mr. Fina's earlier statements today that what we are doing now is legal-ish at best, and I feel that we need to address that immediately. Reflecting on the Council staff document I'm going to pull a quote from that which says, "The first steps would include a review of updated scientific information on stock structure, defining a range of alternatives for stock structure definitions, and considering potential implications and coordinated actions for each alternative". My intent in thinking here is not to necessarily do another stock structure workshop. I think at this point that we have a lot in front of us. We've heard from multiple people that we have a deep literature that we can turn to. So my suggestion would be to do a literature review followed by SSC review. That is what we did under groundfish for the stock definitions there. In terms of workflow, my intention would be for the Council to receive a range of alternatives with an option to select a PPA at our next meeting. I believe the staff document referenced November 2025, but also recognize we usually make those decisions under workload planning scheduled for tomorrow. I...reflecting a little bit on what Miss Szumylo said about not having a dog in this fight, I feel sort of the same way, which is that I would just like to see us pickling and manage to conserve in it and leave that decision to whatever that literature review or other similar process finds for us and make that decision at that point. The most important thing is moving forward. Speaking a little bit to stock assessment frequency, we also heard how important this was, especially around the northern subpopulation of northern anchovy and Pacific mackerel. We've also heard some comments about potentially removing catch-only updates from our process. The SSC noted this as potentially problematic. We also heard, I believe it was from Dr. Yao, pardon me if that's not who we heard from yesterday, but that the capacity difference for NMFS between a catch-only and an update are actually quite similar. So to me it makes sense to just across all of our species that currently use that process to remove the catch-only update and just go to updates. Regarding managing annual opportunity, appreciate the notes that the SSC made on this. I think a framework approach that can better use survey data and be more responsive and data-informed approach, as noted by the SSC, makes a lot of sense. We have management for the central subpopulation and I think that was well thought out and is a seemingly smart way to manage, noting Mr. Fina's comments earlier about catchability, but realize that's a slightly separate issue. So just noting that this framework may be a better approach towards setting more accurate OFLs in the future. Finally, I appreciate the staff's recommendation to think about a new biennial process to prioritize issues as we do in groundfish. Reflected on that, talked to some others, that process isn't perfect and that's okay. The CPS is a different FMP. It behaves differently. It's got fewer species and fewer stocks, so at this moment I'm not recommending that. Obviously open to other motions from other staff, or excuse me, other Council members, but I did want to say how much I appreciate the intent and thought that went into that and if that is a tool that we realize we need to use down the road, that it's something we've got in our back pocket.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:56] Thank you Corey. Questions on the motion? Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:09:05] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And just so I understand a little more specifically, so I am looking at the G.5 Attachment 1 and that list of science and management topics had five bullet points. And so you're proposing adopt that list of five bullet points. And then your motion then would take that list of five bullet points and prioritize it to number one, Pacific sardine stock structure, but that number one would still include consideration of what's number

two in that list of five. Am I correct there? As well as number three for both Pacific sardine and northern subpopulation of northern anchovy in that number one priority package?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:07] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:10:09] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Kiefer. My intent was to only have that for sardine at this moment, but thank you for that clarification. As it became clear, the number two and number three were sort of subsumed into that number one. So I would like them to remain on the list conceptually for other stocks as well, but hence the prioritization here would be to address that as part of the sardine stock structure first.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:10:37] Thank you, that helps clarify your intent for me.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:41] Thank you Sharon. Okay. Questions on the motion? Corey Niles?

**Corey Niles** [00:10:48] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Corey for putting this together. And yeah I'm supportive of the approach and it's basis, and the SSC Report. I kind of missed the last thing you said that you didn't include but were looking for other Council members to possibly add if they're interested? So were you saying that you don't want to repeat this process again in the future? I'm having listening problems at this point in the meeting, but the....yeah, I'll just, I think, is that what you were saying? Okay.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:32] Corey. Other Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:11:32] Thanks Chair. Thanks other Corey. That is essentially yes. As I was saying I appreciate the staff's thought behind that. We are generally looking for efficiencies in this process, the Council process, and I'm not sure that we need to add that biennial agenda item at this point, but I'm open to other Council members, of course, hearing what they consider about that, and that was the reason I did not include it in this motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:02] Thanks Corey. All right. Okay, we'll open up the floor for discussion. Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:12:14] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a clarification question for Miss Ridings. I was wondering if the, "prioritize the above list" was intended to be the below list of the items or if that refers to the full list of topics in the in Attachment 1? And also just wanted to clarify whether all of the subtopics under two and three were included that prioritization? Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:45] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:45] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Bernaus. You've got me. Can you ask those questions again just a little bit slower?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:55] Katrina.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:12:55] I apologize for the speed. Thank you. Your second bullet, prioritize the above list for possible Council action, I just wanted to clarify whether the above list was

intended to be the below list, items 1, 2, and 3 we see on the screen here, or whether that was intended to be the list in Attachment 1, the full list of five topics. Thank you.

**Corey Ridings** [00:13:23] Thanks Miss Bernaus. It was meant to be the above list. It was referring to prioritization, referencing the items as described by the staff document. Perhaps it seems like I wasn't clear enough. And then saying of those I would like to prioritize them as described below. Does that help?

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:13:45] Yeah, thank you Miss Ridings. And one other question, part two, would be whether items 2 and 3 on your prioritization list include both subtopics in each of those items as described in the attachment? Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:02] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:14:02] Thank you. They do.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:10] Okay, we good? All right, further discussion? Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:14:10] Thanks, just on that minor point of what comes next. I'm going to vote for the motion. I don't know that we would put in another motion, whether we'd do this again, but I will strongly say I don't want to go back to the way it was happening before, where I think Aja said it a little bit ago of where you talk about all the mackerel needs under mackerel, all the sardine under the sardine harvest specifications, anchovy under anchovy, you got, we got stuff in open comment this time on the other anchovy, so it was very here, there, and no one place to really understand all of the requests we were getting from the public, our advisory bodies, everyone else, knowing what the Science Center's workload capacity is. Unfortunately, the center's capacity was limited before and we're just waiting to hear the bad news on what's going to happen to its capacity in the near future. So yeah, I'm voting for this but maybe leaving discussion on what comes next after the vote on this one.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:25] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Okay, Briana Brady.

**Briana Brady** [00:15:30] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Miss Ridings for the motion. I really appreciate all the work you put into it and I'll be voting in support of it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:41] Thank you Briana. All right, I'm not seeing any hands, that means I'm probably going to call for the question here. So okay, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:15:53] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:54] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you Corey. Okay, further discussion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:16:06] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. And maybe a question for Katrina and or Merrick about, I think the proposal was maybe to do this every two years, do we need to take that up now or is that something.....I kind of, I think I agree with the sentiment that it might not be needed while we're working on these issues, but at some point we're going to need a place to talk about priorities. So it would be better to talk that. Just keep that on the back burner and the question of when we do this again we can take up at some other time, but it's not suppressing. But I really

don't think that the way we were doing it before today was transparent to people. I think people who do this understand what they think they want and the Science Center is the same, but it was not happening in the normal way that we've done it and having a discussion of all the various things that could be worked on, and what the scientists and the management teams and advisors can work on, that wasn't really happening. So I think that this was much, much improved over what we were doing before. Just when we do it again, I don't know that we need to answer that now.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:31] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:17:35] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and appreciate the sentiment Mr. Niles. I agree I don't think we need to decide it now, but I do think.....well I do agree that we should have this conversation periodically. What I would propose is that we do what we usually do as staff, which is after we see your motion here we'll regroup over the next couple of weeks and we think through workload and how long this stuff is going to take. And then it strikes me that we might have this conversation again after we make headway with this list, and so that'll allow us to have a more informed discussion about when it comes back.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:15] All right, thanks Merrick. Okay, anyone else? All right, I'm going to turn to Katrina, see what we're doing here.

**Katrina Bernaus** [00:18:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for the discussion on this item. The Council has reviewed, revised, and adopted a list of science and management topics, adopting the list under Agenda Item G.5, Attachment 1, with addition from the topics described in the SSC Supplemental Report. Near-term priorities have also been identified and recommended for scheduling. And further discussions on scheduling will occur under Agenda Item H.3, Future Council Agenda and Workload Planning. And guidance has been provided on the sequencing of these priorities. And the proposed process has been reviewed for the science and management priorities, but it has not been decided to be acted upon at this time. So I believe your business for this item is complete.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:18] Okay, thank you. And great work everyone.



## H. Administrative Matters

### 1. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Questions for Kelly on the overview? And I'm not seeing any. All right, well with that I'll turn to Ryan Wulff. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:00:15] Thank you Chair. I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:18] That's what we're here for by golly, so yes.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:00:21] I'll wait for the tower of power.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:24] There we go.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:00:24] I move the Council appoint Katie Davis to one of the National Marine Fisheries Service positions on the Coastal Pelagic Species Management Team.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:41] All right, thank you Ryan. The language on the screen, okay, looks good. And a second? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Thank you Lynn. Please speak to your motion Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:00:48] Yes, thank you. Miss Davis has been working in the Sustainable Fisheries Division of the West Coast Region since 2022 and has participated in the Council process on CPS and halibut matters since then. She has served on the CPSMT in a temporary capacity for the April and November 24<sup>th</sup> meetings, and has developed Exempted Fishing Permits, Scientific Research Permits, multiple rulemaking packages in ESA and NEPA-related analyses for coastal pelagic species. So therefore we think she should be a great addition to the management team. And finally, I would also like Miss Ames to thank Miss Taylor Debevec for her previous service on the CPSMT. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:29] All right, thank you Ryan. All right I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:01:36] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:37] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right, Kelly how are we doing? Oh, Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:01:51] Thanks. Sorry for taking the floor again. I just, since it wasn't relevant to the motion before you closed out, I just wanted to echo Miss Ames comments towards Mr. Greg Busch for his exemplary service throughout his role as his Director on the Office of Law Enforcement, but also of course, as a member of the EC as part of this Council, so thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:12] Yep, very good. He will be missed. Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:02:19] Yes Mr. Chair, I know we'll get our chance to roast Mr. Busch, but I can't say too many good things about him because Captain Chadwick will get jealous, but Greg was a

gentleman and a scholar to work with and very accommodating and made time when we needed him to, and just an excellent human being besides an excellent police officer for NOAA Fisheries and want to thank him for his service. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:55] Thank you Butch. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:03:00] Well, I'll also miss Mr. Busch. But I wanted to, well it's not really a membership appointment, it's really the other way around. I thought this might be an opportune time to mention the newly named Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries since that came out today. I don't know if I want to do it or if Ryan wants to do it?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:24] All right, almost steal Ryan's thunder there. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:03:29] Yeah, thank you. I guess that is, would be a relevant agenda item. So yes, the National Marine Fisheries Service has announced Eugenio Pineiro Soler as our next Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries. Mr. Pineiro Soler has enjoyed a long and illustrious life in fisheries management. He has a career spanning over 30 years as a successful commercial fisherman, fisheries captain, entrepreneur in his home island of Puerto Rico. He has been engaged in the Council process. He served as Chair of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council from 2001 to 2010. He has also been a Commissioner to the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, or ICAT, and participated in that delegation as well as delegations to the International Whaling Commission and been a member of the Marine Protected Area Federal Advisory Committee amongst other things. And he had a brief stint in the last Trump administration as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere. So he brings a lot of experience. He's very familiar with the Council process. I've worked with him as has Dr. Lent on the ICAT delegation. I think, I know Executive Director Burden and your Chair and Vice-Chair will get a chance to meet with him in the upcoming CCC. And yeah, thank you Marc for allowing me to make that announcement. It was just announced two hours ago so it is fresh news. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:01] Very good. Thank You. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:05:03] I just want to say, and you might share this sentiment Brad, that the new Assistant Administrator was on the Caribbean Council for nine years and apparently was Chair for all nine years, so us fellow Chairs must, you know, respect that.....(laughter)....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:25] Definitely, we're looking forward to meeting him next month so absolutely that. Okay, I'll scan the room one more time. Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:05:38] Great, thank you Council. We will get Miss Katie Davis's nomination package submitted and get her into the roster for the CPSMT and you'll see her at future meetings. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:52] All right, good deal. Well, I know Greg Busch moved to Gearhart, Oregon so you may see him clam digging maybe on a beach nearby so maybe I'll look for him at low tide. So all right, with that, that finishes H.1 up.



## **2. Fiscal Matters**

No transcription for this agenda item.

### 3. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right, that concludes public comment which takes us to Council action. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:07] Yeah, thank you. Maybe in the interest of helping to lead into some Council discussion here, I appreciate all the input from the advisory bodies, the public, and some of the Q&A that you all had. And throughout the course of that I've made a couple of notes, proposals here on my Year-At-a-Glance summary that would potentially change what we're looking at through the balance of the year. So one thing that I would suggest we have on the docket for June shaded for now is what I'll call the Deregulatory Order, so some discussion in the Council about what that might mean for our future planning, what it means for the agenda items we might take up and implementing regulations or lack thereof. So as Mr. Wulff indicated, we are planning to take this up during the CCC meeting and we hope that we'll have more clarity at that time. Another thing I made note of was Mr. German's suggestion that we combine the Tri-State Enforcement Report and the U.S. Coast Guard Report into one meeting. I think that makes some sense. And then I made note of the CPSMT's suggestion that we strike CPS EFPs in November. So those are the three things that I'll offer up to you all that have sort of wedged themselves in my mind after listening to these conversations. But of course there are a few other ideas and happy to discuss any of those.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:43] Okay, with that, I'll open the floor for discussion. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:01:47] Thank you Chair, and thank you Executive Director Burden for that report. I wonder if we could also discuss the latest guidance from O.... I don't know if it was from OMB or OIRA about NEPA? It'd be helpful to have an update on that. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:03] Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:02:09] Yeah, through the Chair, thank you Dr. Lent for the question. I'm afraid I don't have an update on that at this point in time. I will see what I can find while we sit here but.....and I'm not certain about whether that will be discussed at the CCC yet too, but let me see if I can find a little bit more information. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:26] Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:02:30] Yeah sorry, I should have been clear. I meant for this next June event meeting where we will be discussing various things if you have an update at the time. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:41] Okay, thank you Ryan. Anyone else? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:47] Thank you Chair. I'm going to speak, try to help speak to the questions that the GMT posed to us on some recommendations on how they should prioritize. I really appreciate Executive Director Burden and Deputy Director Ames' proactive changes to the Draft June Agenda based on the GMT Report. I had the opportunity to sit and pencil stuff out with Miss Waller from Council staff, and I know she's been talking with Mr. Phillips. I did not check with my counterparts to the north and south to see if they agree with this, so they may have some

additional thoughts, but after a strategy session with Miss Waller I think the GMT should prioritized....their highest priority should be Stock Definitions and Inseason Management. Their secondary priorities should be Adopt Stock Assessments and the Harvest Specifications Planning. Do not prioritize C.1, NMFS Report, and probably do not prioritize C.2, Limited Entry Fixed Gear Follow-On FPA as that has pretty well done. Do have a question mark right now on C.5, Intersection Allocation, and C.7, Harvest Specifications Flexibility Scoping, that may depend on what comes about in the briefing book. But again, trying to prioritize stock definitions and inseason as the two top priorities and then stock assessments and spex planning as the next highest priorities. The GMT did recommend starting at 1 on June 11th. The draft agenda has them starting at 8. Talking with Miss Waller yesterday, that was assuming that some of the GMT members would be wanting to participate in the SSC meeting that morning, and I think Miss Waller, Mr. Phillips, and the GMT leadership will work on scheduling stuff in the morning for the GMT so that they can be strategic in who's going where. So hopefully that helps the GMT with some of their planning. And this isn't from the full GMT, this is just from the two GMT folks that work with me. Looking to September, there are four very....there's well three out of four groundfish items on day one of the Council meeting are potentially fairly meaty items and they are wondering if they can maybe, again, this is just from Christian and Katlyn, wondering about a September 17th start for the GMT so that they have a day and a half or two days to start working on reports for some meaty items on the first day of the Council meeting. And we can discuss that piece more in June when we know better what our September agenda is, but I was asked to flag that as a possibility. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:06] Thank you Lynn. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:06:07] Thank you. And thank you Lynn for working through some of that with folks. I agree with everything you said. And I was just reflecting, Miss Lent earlier this week said, like, everything is pre-chewed for us and we're like little baby birds getting the information fed into our mouths. And I don't think that we need to have that in every case, and so I would like this practice there more of, especially with the GMT when they have a really weighty meeting, kind of cutting down what they really need to focus on. I would, yeah, extend that same suggestion to the GAP if possible, like just to say, yeah, we might not need reports for everything, and I think that that could streamline some of our, their workload, especially as we're reducing time for these meetings. So I support everything that you said about June though.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:59] Thank you Aja. Anyone else? Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:59] Thanks Mr. Chair. I just checked real quick in response to Dr. Lent's question. The CCC will be discussing the NEPA issue at the May meeting. So I'll leave it to Executive Director because we have a CCC update on the agenda already when.....and there's room, we could put two or three hours for NEPA and deregulation in there, but we will discuss it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:33] All right, thank you Pete. Anyone else? Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:07:40] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And then just in response to the GMT prioritization, thank you for that overview Miss Mattes. Just to make sure we're on the same page, I think some of the things that we look to the GMT to help with could just be peer-to-peer exchange and might not need floor time. And so as I think about your question about Intersector Allocation Review there are some dynamics there that current and former Council members have been concerned about and so it may warrant a team statement. I would at a minimum envision the

GMT and Miss Waller having an exchange about that item and so maybe it's just a peer-to-peer discussion, but I'm happy to talk more with Miss Ames and Miss Waller about whether we should expect or plan for a GMT statement there. I think there's still a, there might still be good reason to.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:42] Okay, Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:42] Through the Chair, thank you Executive Director Burden. I appreciate that and just because I said it wasn't a priority I didn't expect they wouldn't talk about it at all. There was just those two items that there's a bit of unknown as to what all they're going to contain and I think that will determine it. But yeah, I do expect the GMT and GAP will be having discussions about these with careful guidance from their staff officers. So I definitely appreciate the clarification.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:08] All right, thanks Lynn. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:09:12] Thanks Chair. I'm thinking a little bit about the public comment we heard today as well as on day one regarding the northern sub- population of northern anchovy, and also reflecting on the discussion we had yesterday, I think that yesterday we made some progress towards some of the longer term issues regarding that stock in terms of thinking about if and when a stock assessment is necessary as well as the distribution term. I think Dr. Shester and Oceana raise very good points, however, about what is the current biomass of that stock and what are our management obligations there are and sort of the shorter term nature, which he spoke to today, that differs from the work that we talked about yesterday. So I think I'm leaning towards perhaps a suggestion to think about adding an item in November, which is the next time our CPS folks meet to be able to address this concern. And I think my initial thinking around this would be to, and looking for obviously thoughts from around the table, especially Council staff, about some sort of discussion draft or white paper or sort of status document that could outline a little bit of where we are there and provide the Council some updates on where we are with the science behind that, the BSIA, the current management structure, and help us figure out under that point of concern framework, which I think we have met, if further steps are warranted.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:51] Thank you Corey. Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:10:56] Thanks Mr. Chair. I think yesterday was the place to talk about this. I know it was the first time we did this, but in my mind it was in the mix of things we discussed for priority yesterday. Again, it was a new, the first-time we've done it for CPS and so different expectations, but that's where we have to ask all, think about all the work that's needed and the staff at the Science Centers, the management teams, and everywhere else, and then figure out what our highest priorities are. So I'm going to, again, repeat, I think that's the value of that item. We left it open as when it comes back again, but we can't be doing this. It's not efficient to be doing this in the workload planning item. And I think what I heard from the teams was the catch is low. Yeah, maybe....you know we expect biomass to fluctuate, I think that was known when the OFL was set. I don't remember the details. Again, it's not good to bring up the details now. I know WDFW, we do collect the fishery-dependent data. The landings are small. But I think that was in the mix of things yesterday but maybe the National Marine Fisheries Service has a response, but I know within our delegation talked about the feasibility of doing an assessment and quite a bit of work and not a lot of catch or a lot of data that would go into it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:33] Thank you Corey. All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:33] Thanks Chair, I wanted to give a....I don't know if NMFS wanted to respond to Mr. Niles or not? Okay. Excuse me. Thanks Mr. Niles for your thoughts on that. I completely agree with you in terms of how this Council decides to prioritize work and kind of keeping those lanes, staying in our lanes and being very thoughtful about where that's done. I think I....I guess I'm not disagreeing with you, but sort of adding to that in the sense that what we discussed yesterday was the things that we discussed were longer term in terms of thinking about if and when to have a stock assessment for our stocks or various species within the FMP, also thinking about that distribution term. But in my mind, we didn't specifically have a discussion around this issue, which to me feels shorter, and that is around the point of concern framework. I know we have had evidence presented to us that would in my mind trigger that point of concern framework, and so I feel it is our obligation to address that. I really appreciate what you said about Washington's perspective. I will fully own that I have not dug into that data. I'm not kind of aware of that. It's not top of mind in the sense it hasn't been, at least to my knowledge, presented to us recently in a way where we can think about this. So my request was sort of to do that, which is to have some of that data presented to us so we could definitively decide if that point of concern framework had been triggered and taking further action was necessary.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:10] Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:14:18] Thanks Corey. And again, totally normal to have different expectations of what happened yesterday. But I'm disputing this difference between short and long-term difference. Yesterday was where we talked....if we could do everything we would have done it now. And I'm not criticizing what, but we can't because we only have so many scientists and management team members. And so what we're doing is picking the, You know, and yeah, there's probably ways of improving most of what we have. It doesn't mean that everything we have is wrong or contrary to law but we could do improvements, and if we had all the staff in the world we would take them up now. And that's what we were doing yesterday, what is the highest conservation needs and the best use of staff resources? So I'm just not seeing it as short versus long-term. And sorry Ryan, I know you have a response.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:13] Thank you Corey. Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:15:13] No, I didn't, I wasn't trying to rush you Corey. I appreciate your points there and agree with you on kind of the process discussion. To the other Corey, also appreciate, you know, the general comments that if we are potentially hearing something that could trigger this that we should start to think about it. But I would just note that from NMFS perspective I think we have a disagreement with some of the comments that were made of whether this really is at that level. And since it really is kind of one of our main responsibilities to come to this Council if we see concern in our work we would do so. We will do so, we have done so, that's really our job. As we heard from the SSC those ATM estimates cannot be viewed as total biomass numbers. And so from our perspective we don't, from our perspective I think kind of Corey, Corey Niles touched on this too, the concern in our view for the stock is actually very low and it's not in a situation to trigger that. So thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:25] Corey Ridings.



**Corey Ridings** [00:16:25] Thanks Chair. Thanks Mr. Wulff. That's very helpful to hear that described that way. Perhaps I could just request, adjust my request then and say nothing is needed on the agenda but to say if NMFS would be willing to Include that as part of their NMFS Report in November to provide a little bit more background, maybe a little bit more data so that the Council could revisit that and just get a slightly deeper understanding of what you're describing and make sure that we're responding to what we heard and make sure that we do not need to trigger that point of concern framework.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:59] Okay, thanks Corey. All right, Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:17:04] I was going to change topics Lynn, did you have....? Okay, a couple thoughts, somewhat tidier. First of all Merrick thank you for picking up on that deregulatory guidance in the CCC. I think it is....we do need, and the gear switching was an example of a rule that's going through. I can't think of other examples, and there could be consequences of that on some other things, so appreciate you picking up that and the Enforcement Consultants and Coast Guards recommendations. So, and if you said this in your overview I missed it, and I'm having trouble reading this morning, but so on this you're also, what's going on, we have a stock assessment, hiring a consultant to review our stock assessment process and how is that fitting in on the Year-At-a-Glance?

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

**Merrick Burden** [00:18:00] Yeah, thank you Mr. Niles. Let's see, a quick update on that process. So we did have an RFP that was put out shortly after, I don't know, all the timelines run together in my head, but it closed recently. We had two very excellent bids. I am still really wrangling over which one to select, but I'll have to do that here in the next day or two in order to make headway. So both of those bids contemplate ending the project in December, having a final report in December. And what I have contemplated is the schedule will depend on the outcome of that report. And what I, what I would anticipate us doing is taking that report and then several of you working with me and folks from the Science Centers to say, what does this mean for us and do we want to try to reformulate or reconstruct our process? That does not show up on the YAG right now, but I think it may make sense to make note of it or shade it somewhere just so we don't forget that this will come back. I certainly won't forget, but perhaps in the interest of transparency and communication that we do expect something to show up early next year. Does that answering your question Mr. Niles?

**Corey Niles** [00:19:18] Yes, thank you Merrick. Perfect. And not totally connected, but somewhat connected, on the STAR Panel comments that I asked a question about to the SSC, I don't know what Council....and I'm sure Council staff is helping with the Science Centers and everyone, but I would encourage, strongly encourage you to help find another reviewer for that yellowtail panel. I know our SSC is stretched thin, but I, you know, and someone who's actually done their PhD in stock assessment, I think there's....you're going to have one CIE reviewer. And I think John Budrick probably earned his overtime, a second PhD in stock assessment. But the....you know, our process will, our process will be reviewed. Maybe it's overkill when we get the report back, but I think another reviewer is needed for both those panels. On that, we do probably have an individual or two, Teresa's working on too many STAT Teams, excuse me, and Fabio as well. But I'm just offering, and I'm sure the same is for ODFW, CDFW, and if they can't find a NMFS or someone else then the states may have folks who could serve as reviewers. But I don't know, it's been a long

time since I know what Council staff's role is in helping with that, but I know you do help in asking you to do what we can to find another reviewer for those panels.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:59] Thanks Corey. Okay, Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:21:00] Yeah, thanks Mr. Niles. Just to, I'll just confirm that we are, we are working on that and trying to help shore up some of the things that NMFS has been unable to do here over the last few months. Thankfully our friend and colleague John DeVore has a list of potential people that could be reviewers and so we've been going over that and adding to it. And, you know, time is short between now and May, but I'm hopeful we can find someone.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:35] Okay. All right, Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:21:35] Thank you Chair. A couple of...two small, well hopefully small items, looking forward. The HMSMT request for June, I know there's a lot of flux and uncertainty with NMFS and knowing when and if they can travel and we might not have it in time, but the consideration in the HMSMT asked about either everyone in-person or everyone online. We'd just like y'all to keep that in mind as you're scheduling and as we get closer to the June meeting. Who knows what's going to be going on with the NMFS travel at the time and it may not be possible but just wanted to keep that in mind. The other piece is the Harvest Specifications Flexibility Scoping item. I know a lot of people are calling it SpexFlex. I'm afraid to say that too often because I'm going to get tongue-tied. We have scoping on the agenda in June and based on our back-and-forth during open comment and some of our discussions under, I think it was C.4 about wanting to move forward, I don't see that item anywhere else on the Year-At-a-Glance. Just for my own thinking, just to make sure I'm thinking kind of the same lines you all are, depending on what comes out of scoping, is that what will determine when we schedule things next? Because maybe right now it's too soon to put that on the schedule because we don't know what it might involve. Is that the thinking and we'll see more in June? Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:16] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:23:16] Yeah, appreciate the question Miss Mattes, and I'm happy to look to Kelly too to help with the answer, but what we'd envision doing is now that we are unshading it and looking to move forward we'll go through scoping, we'll do our work planning, we'll get added clarity about what this looks like and how we can proceed and execute on the work. That then allows us to fill out the Year-At-a-Glance in a little more, a little more informative way than it is now. So I know Kelly if you want to add anything to that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:46] Kelly. Good? Okay. Thumbs up.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:23:50] Yeah, thank you for that clarification. And I think that'll help some of our public who are listening too to know what that plan is. So thank you very much.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:58] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:23:58] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I appreciate Miss Mattes' comments. Yeah, my note of the HMSMT Report as well, we will work on that. The Council meetings have been prioritized at least to get clarity on NMFS travel. We obviously had a little bit more attendees at

this one so we'll be working on that with Council staff. I will take that into account and try to get understanding on that as soon as we can, and definitely well before the meeting notice goes out so there's advance time. I also wanted to note the fact that it looks like we have a kind of a shorter day on Sunday and then a longer day on day last and I believe, and Miss Ames can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe some of that intent is probably been because of my interventions that NMFS has challenges on weekend and we have some very substantial agenda items on Monday right now on the groundfish side. So again, there has been increased support for NMFS engagement at least at Council meetings, so should there, should I get more information between now and the time the meeting notice needs to come out that we would be able to participate more either remotely, or on that Sunday perhaps then some of those items could be moved up so that we have a shorter day last. But if it's okay with the Council I would probably need some time between now and the next meeting to work that out with Council staff. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:31] Okay, thank you Ryan. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:25:31] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair, and I thank Miss Mattes for raising the issue of the special projects. I believe that at the next FIW meeting we'll have a report on Special Project Number 3 and how that's going to be integrated into the FIWs work, and hopefully report out on that as well under the agenda item that's currently labeled as "HMS Roadmap". Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:58] Thanks Rebecca. Anyone else? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:26:01] Thanks Chair. I'm looking at the SSC Report and just wanted to note the SSC Economic Subcommittee that's proposing to review the Trawl Catch Share Program Review in advance of the meeting, so just that sounds like a good idea and endorsing that. Hope we can have that happen. Also, the CPS Subcommittee doing a review of the new integrated survey, I know that moving into that survey being integrated, we heard from a lot of the public some concerns about what would be lost in that, so I think it would be beneficial to make sure that that extra review is provided as well as recommended by the SSC. And finally, I think this is perhaps a question for Council staff, the SSC has also noted about Preseason Report 1 and how that was given to the SSC a couple days before the March meeting and that they note can limit comprehensive and careful review by all members, so they've made the suggestion of a comprehensive view between April and November. So I guess I'm putting that out to Council staff if that seems reasonable.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:14] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:27:16] Thank you. And this is something that we're continuing to try to find better ways for the SSC to have a more careful review with our salmon documents. I don't have an initial reaction to that timeline other than to say it seems reasonable, but I don't have all the details in my mind. So I'll look at Kelly and see if you have anything else to add Kelly?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:44] Okay, Thanks Corey. Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:27:49] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. On the topic of salmon and even perhaps in response to Corey's suggestion, we might have yet another salmon agenda item here later in the fall. I just want to go back to your response, Merrick, on the potential for in-person for the salmon groups in September. I completely understand where you're coming from with regard to scheduling

advisory bodies in-person and the need for efficiencies and cost savings, but I would just hope that as we get closer to September we give this some serious thought. I'm just thinking about the weight of the items scheduled right now for September and they're awfully meaty and of course NMFS travel has a role here. But I would just, you know, recommend that maybe we consider shading the in the little new matrix here rather than remote for September TBD would be possible.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:12] Okay.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:29:13] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:13] Thank you Marci. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:29:18] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And I'm.....this is a.... I'm looking for confirmation on my understanding of something regarding the Specifications Flexibility action. And then, yeah sort of, I mean this is just general understanding too for other actions for scheduling and for communication back to industry. With that action in particular, the comment at the beginning of the meeting from groundfish industry was really focused on, they were looking for a certain schedule around when that action would play out. And my understanding of how I'm seeing things on the schedule right now is that we're scheduling scoping for June, but that we can't necessarily schedule out further because we also don't really know what the scope of that action will be. And then we're leaving latitude for the Council and Council staff to tell us when they're able to bring things back and think through the best path forward for that, rather than trying to force things into the schedule anymore. So really just looking for confirmation that that's how we intend to approach things? In the past when I've sat on this Council too, we did a lot of fighting during this agenda item about like setting the exact timeline for things, and then I know that that can also create some uncertainty for industry too when they're looking for something to play out over a certain schedule. And it probably also creates uncertainty and anxiety for Council staff when they're looking to like push forward work when like they may need more time or it may align with a broader schedule. So I just wanted to like say that in public and hear you guys respond to that in public and ground-truth whether your view of the world is the same as mine. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:55] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:30:55] Yeah, thank you. Appreciate that question. It sounds like you do have it right Miss Szumylo. What we're doing is looking to get more information and clarity about what that item is through the scoping action. Kelly and I then work closely with the staff officers to map out a schedule that's doable and can bring you the materials that are adequate to help support decision-making. And so that's in response to one of your comments where in the past I recall this too, the Council used to specify when you wanted things done. Kelly and I have taken some of that territory back and said, we'll tell you when we're ready, and so there's a bit of a dance we have to do here. And so but I do think it's important that we as staff have the time to produce materials that are adequate for the record that help explore all the trade-offs and help make sure you can make a good decision. So that's why we've taken some of that. I would just say that it's clear to me there's a lot of interest in doing this in a, I won't say rapid fashion, but there are some urgent issues that I think a lot of you are keying in on and hoping that we can move quickly on, and we have heard that, so I don't expect this to be something that we stretch out for years and years.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:15] Thank you Aja. All right, I'm not seeing any of the hands Merrick. Okay. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:32:30] Yeah, just say thank you for the healthy, robust discussion here. Lots of good ideas and Kelly I'll look to you see if you have anything else you wanted to add or any questions in your mind? Otherwise I think you're doing well. I think we're done. Okay, thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:47] Alrighty, well done everyone.