

COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
280th Session of the
Pacific Fishery Management Council
March 4-11, 2025
Hilton Vancouver Washington
301 W. Sixth Street, Vancouver, WA 98660

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

Contents

- Meeting Transcript Summary 3
- A. Call to Order 4
 - 3. Agenda 4
- B. Open Comment Period..... 5
 - 1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items..... 5
- C. Pacific Halibut Management..... 7
 - 1. Annual Report of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) 7
 - 2. Incidental Catch Recommendations: Options for Salmon Troll and Final Action for Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries 9
- D. Cross Fishery Management Plan 19
 - ~~1. United States Coast Guard Annual Report~~ - Cancelled..... 19
 - 2. Marine Planning..... 20
- E. Salmon Management 22
 - 1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report..... 22
 - 2. Review of 2024 Fisheries and Summary of 2025 Stock Forecasts..... 25
 - 3. Identify Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2025 Management Alternatives 30
 - 4. Recommendations for 2025 Management Alternative Analysis 35
 - 5. Further Direction for 2025 Management Alternatives..... 42
 - 6. Further Direction for 2025 Management Alternatives..... 43
 - 7. Adopt 2025 Management Alternatives for Public Review 47
 - 8. Appoint Salmon Hearings Officers..... 58
- F. Ecosystem Management 59
 - 1. 2024-25 California Current Ecosystem Status Report and 2025 Science Review Topics..... 59
- G. Habitat Issues 69
 - 1. Current Habitat Issues..... 69

H. Groundfish Management	71
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report	71
2. Humpback Whale and Leatherback Sea Turtle Biological Opinion.....	73
3. Implementation of the 2025 Pacific Whiting Fishery Under the U.S./Canada Agreement and 2025 Fishery	76
4. Final Assessment Methodologies	96
5. Cordell Bank Conservation Area Revisions – Final	100
6. Phase 2 Stock Definitions	103
7. Limited Entry Fixed Gear Actions; Gear Endorsements, Cost Recovery, and Other Administrative Changes.....	127
8. Workload and New Management Measures Priorities	131
9. Inseason Adjustments – Final	149
I. Highly Migratory Species Management	152
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	152
2. International Management Activities.....	153
3. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap.....	154
J. Administrative Matters	161
1. Legislative Matters.....	161
2. Approve Council Meeting Record	170
3. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures	171
4. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.....	181

Meeting Transcript Summary

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

A. Call to Order

3. Agenda

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Thank you Director Burden. Okay, with that we'll go to the.....and we have a revised agenda. Dani. Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:00:20] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Good morning. I move that the Council approve the amended agenda as described in A.3 for the March 2025 Pacific Fishery Management Council.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:36] All right, thank you Dani. Looking for a second. Second by David Sones. Thank you David. All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:00:47] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:47] Opposed? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

B. Open Comment Period

1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That concludes public comment and we've been at it for a while so. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:10] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Kind of synthesizing and mulling over a few of the remarks we heard under this agenda item today, I thought I might just take an opportunity, if I may, to just talk a little bit with National Marine Fisheries Service about the stock assessment activities that are currently underway. The Council had a very robust discussion on stock assessment priorities. Back in September we recommended a final list of species to be assessed in this upcoming cycle. The work is well underway. We've held a number of pre-assessment data workshops. STAT teams are hard at work. But I'm thinking back to a few of the earlier cycles and perhaps want to emphasize that a need for communication between the Council and NMFS on the progress of those stock assessments early and often, I think would help us all think through some of these issues. I'm concerned about being blindsided. Oftentimes we've found a draft assessment in the briefing book for a June meeting that we didn't expect to see or know much about before it dropped and kind of that set us on a course that really we didn't have a lot of flexibility to move around on. So I'm just hearing some of the remarks in some of the earlier speakers about concerns about capacity, concerns about aging. We've heard some of those concerns before. We've heard Science Centers back I think in June of last year convey to us that their capacities were limited and we were going to need to curb our appetite in terms of what we put on the plate. And then in September we heard a little bit of a different message that, yes, we can do this list. We are confident that the aging that's on the plate will get done. But I guess, again, maybe this isn't the time, but I'm very curious to hear, especially because a lot has happened in the last six months since we had that final action in September on stock assessments, are we on track with the species that are on the list? And you know we hear the plea with regard to shortspine. It sounds to me like, you know, there is no capacity to do anything right here and now. But then, you know, we did create quite a lofty list, at least in my opinion, back in September of the requests for benchmarks and updates. So I'm just hoping, and maybe now isn't the right time, but hoping to learn more from National Marine Fisheries Service on the landscape and the progress and where we're at with the stocks that are being assessed in the current cycle. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:34] Jennifer Quan.

Jennifer Quan [00:03:34] Yeah, thank you. Thanks for the question Marci. I think I'm going to have to defer on this to work with our Science Center folks to get back with you, especially given the recent events. I think it's a relevant question and I do think that this will come up again in a later agenda item so we'll have time to have the right people at the table to talk about it a little bit more.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:05] Thank you Jennifer. Marci. Thank you. All right. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:04:11] Thank you Chair. I just want to take a quick second to appreciate the Open Comment that we had this morning and the importance of it. I didn't ask any questions but I appreciated every one of the public comments and the information that was presented and how

related it is to where we are with how we do our work. The science we need to inform conservation and management, and the real implications that not having those resources has on fishermen, fisherwomen that we represent. And so I just wanted to make that point. A really valuable Open Comment this morning and important. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:04] Thank you Heather. All right I'm not seeing any other hands so with that this will conclude our public comment, B.1.

C. Pacific Halibut Management

1. Annual Report of the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC)

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That concludes our reports and I don't think there's any public comment. Okay that confirms that. All right we're getting close to being done here so I'll open the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:17] Thank you Chair. In Dr. Hutniczak's presentation she did mention there's an IPHC MSAB meeting in early May in Juneau. I am the Council's designee to that forum. For a couple of reasons I'm not going to be able to participate in that meeting in-person, but I believe IPHC, especially Dr. Hicks, or yeah, Dr. Allan Hicks, who coordinates that, is going to have it available so that myself and some others can participate remotely. So just let you know that I'm going to be participating in that in May.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:50] Thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:59] Thank you Chair. I was going to let others go. This is going to be a question for NMFS, but it's sort of related to this, and I didn't know when else to bring it up is, and I gave Miss Quan a heads-up. I was going to ask this at the break. There's some concern and some nervousness from some folks about the publication of the Halibut Rule that results from the IPHC annual meeting. Just wondering, I know you mentioned earlier under Open Comment that things were in the works, but do you have any details on timing or what happens if we get to May, I think May 1st is when all of our fisheries start or some in mid-April, what happens if we get to those dates and the final rule has not yet been published? Thank you.

Jennifer Quan [00:01:49] Thanks for the question. We are, you know first of all, so we're tracking a few fisheries and rules that are in this position and so we're pushing hard at headquarters right now. That's the first thing that we're doing. And I mentioned before, I think we've gotten approval all the way through our NOAA offices and now we're in the DOC realm. So we are, we're doing that and we're also asking that question what happens if those, if they don't get cleared? So, and that's, so we're doing the legal analysis right now. We're doing kind of some risk assessments. So I don't have a complete answer for you yet. I just want everyone to know that for all of those we are looking at that and I think that's something we need to have an answer on ASAP, and as soon we do we will be circling back with everyone as we move forward into that. I guess I would just note on a bigger picture, I think that asking that question, at least for me, has made me start thinking about if we are in a deregulatory posture, what opportunities do we have to evolve how we do our rules going forward? So I think there could be some opportunities for hopefully maybe even streamlining some of this in the future, not everything, but some things. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:23] Thank you Lynn. Chris Oliver.

Chris Oliver [00:03:23] Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't want...I don't mean to speak out of turn, but I have this recollection that there's a mechanism in halibut where last year's regulations automatically roll over if new ones aren't put in place? Or I might be confusing that with the overall, with only one part of it.

Jennifer Quan [00:03:44] So there are.....depends what fishery so it's not for every fishery and I don't know that it's for the halibut one, so let me finish working through my, that review and and we'll get back to folks

Brad Pettinger [00:04:00] Thanks Jennifer. Okay, thank you Chris. Anyone else? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:04:09] Just a little historical perspective, not to take anything away from Bob 'the halibut' Alverson, but and a great job he did, but I think the last time I saw Phil on that side of the table I was 18 years old. I am now 60 years old. So just a little perspective on the last time we saw Phil in that seat, and it was a little bit different than we've witnessed before in the past. So just throw a little history in there.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:40] Thank you for that historical moment. All right, thank you Butch. Okay I don't see any other hands. I'm going to wrap up C.1.

2. Incidental Catch Recommendations: Options for Salmon Troll and Final Action for Fixed Gear Sablefish Fisheries

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, public comment, takes us to Council and discussion and action. Give a few seconds here that will pop up on the screen. There are the three tasks before for us. And as you have looked over those I want to see if there's any hand to initiate discussion on this agenda item? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:00:33] Thank you Vice-Chair. I just wanted to offer appreciation for the GMT for helping with the salmon troll analysis and looking at that. I know it's not a groundfish so appreciate their help with that and the input that they provided to help with the ratio for halibut in the sablefish fishery. I do have a motion when folks are ready. I don't want to limit any further discussion but I flag that I do have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:11] All right, let me look around and make sure that's.... Jennifer Quan.

Jennifer Quan [00:01:18] I'm not sure this is the right time to give this comment or not and just to bearer of really good news, but I just wanted to flag the Council's welcome to make a recommendation on the salmon inseason. I understand the issue and I just, the flag is we don't know whether we'd be able to make it through a regulatory process, doesn't mean we won't try, but couldn't guarantee it. So as you're thinking about it. Sorry. I think it's Number 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:00] And that pertains, so can you go back to the list of actions? So what you're saying is just the inseason change, the salmon fishery that will be closing May 15th changes to that?

Jennifer Quan [00:02:23] Correct.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:24] Okay.

Jennifer Quan [00:02:24] Thank you for your help.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:26] Okay, we have a motion in waiting. I just want to make sure, see if there's any other discussion? I'm not seeing any, then Heather let's have your motion.

Heather Hall [00:02:44] I move the Council adopt for public review the alternatives presented in Agenda Item C.2.a, Supplemental SAS Report 1, March 2025 for halibut landing restrictions in the salmon troll fishery in 2025 beginning May 16th through the end of 2025 salmon troll fishery and beginning April 1, 2026 unless modified through inseason action are superseded by 2026 management measures.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:27] Okay, I followed along there. What's on the screen looks accurate and complete?

Heather Hall [00:03:30] Yes it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:31] Okay. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion.

Heather Hall [00:03:39] Thank you. This motion is for the time period beginning May 16th. So I just want to note that, and this refers to the comment that we just heard from Miss Quan, that it does not include an inseason change as was recommended by the SAS to increase the landing limit for May 1 to April 1 for this year, an inseason change. It's easy to get wrapped around those dates on the salmon troll one, at least for me anyway. So I just wanted to say that this motion does not include that, but it does include their request to add Alternative 2 to the range of alternatives. So I think this would allow us to have that come-back in April and we can analyze the range of alternatives before adopting that, and so I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:47] Thank you. Are there any questions for the maker of the motion for clarification? No questions. Any discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:01] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'd like to offer an amendment to the motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:07] Please go ahead.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:13] I'm just doing this verbally so I will be slow. Amend Alternative 2 so that the number 40 is replaced with the number 25.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:52] All right, what's on the screen is accurate and complete, do you agree?

Marci Yaremko [00:05:58] Yes, it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:01] Okay. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:08] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We have a long history of noticing a range of alternatives in March for consideration in April with regard to both the ratio requirement and the maximum number of halibut that may be landed per trip. I appreciate the discussion we had with Mr. Johnson. And I also, I'm glad to hear that it does look like you may have some decent Chinook opportunity north of Falcon that might allow you to fish for Chinook with vessel limits in your fishing periods that are higher than what we've seen in recent years. That's very good for the salmon fisheries. However, I continue to have ongoing concerns with what is intended by this incidental authorization of Pacific halibut in the salmon troll fishery. If you are mixing your targets, and as we heard from Mr. Johnson, to the extent that you're discarding halibut while targeting salmon, there's a fairly easy solution which is to pull your gear and move your operation to an area where there's fewer halibut. It's just very difficult to consider a number of 40 halibut in a trip which may have a limit of 60 Chinook, that that's truly an incidental opportunity. So also considering that we have a number of other West Coast commercial fisheries, as we heard from Mr. Clampett, that encounter Pacific halibut incidentally that have zero allocation of incidental allowance and they must discard all of those fish. So in the spirit of keeping to the goal of maintaining this incidental opportunity as truly an incidental opportunity, I'd like to see the range of alternatives that we put forward be what it traditionally is. And the numbers that we've traditionally offered in this agenda item have been a max per trip of 25, 30, and 35. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:30] Thank you. Are there any questions for clarification on the motion to amend? David Sones.

David Sones [00:08:44] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I wasn't clear on if they go to 40 does it change the overall number that they have allocated to the troll fishery? It wouldn't increase their number so that's one thing. Okay, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:04] Other questions for clarification? Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:09:12] Thank you Vice-Chair. Just a question for Marci about why you ask for a substitution rather than just simply adding it to the range for consideration so that the advisory bodies can weigh-in on that alternative as compared to the alternative that's already there that they were evaluating before?

Pete Hassemer [00:09:34] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe they're putting forward to us their proposals for the range of alternatives that should be put out for public review. The current vessel trip limit on the maximum number of halibut that can be delivered is 35, and the Attachment 1 I believe outlines the history of the max allowed per trip as well as the history of the ratio requirements. The ratio requirements I think have varied from, I'm not staring at it right now, one plus one per each up to four, and then currently we're down at two. And then the max number of halibut per trip has seen a high of 35 and a low of 12. So right now we are at kind of the highest allowance in terms of what incidental means looking at our history. So by putting out a range of alternatives that does not provide an increase that's what I'm intending to do. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:09] Any further questions for clarification? Discussion on the motion to amend? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:11:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I will not be supporting the amendment for these reasons. One is these are to go out for to be analysis and to the area that Mr. Johnson was speaking is absolutely full of sea life and salmon and rich area and also, fortunate or unfortunate however you think about it, is halibut and simply pulling your lines and moving because there's halibut there you're also moving away from salmon, and if this fishery stopped and targeted on halibut that would be one thing, but the halibut in this area are all the way up the water column. And you know we've all been depressed in our fisheries up and down the coast, not quite as bad as California, but we do have, and gladly have, some California participants in our fisheries up the Washington coast, and glad to have them in our ports and the ability to do that. So I think that for analysis and we're not raising the quota, they're not stopping to non-target on these halibut, it's by prosecuting the salmon fisheries, I think for analysis purposes I think I won't be supporting the amendment but will be supporting the motion. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:04] Thank you. Further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:10] Thank you Vice-Chair. Mr. Smith hit on one of the things I was thinking of is that we are talking about range of alternatives right now. We could come back and get some more information and when we get to the main motion I may have a request for Council, NMFS,

and or ODFW staff for some additional information to see if we can see how many people have met the trip limits at the current level. The other piece is that is coming to my mind is that the ratio is not changing. So if there is a 60 fish limit, a Chinook limit, they would then be limited to 32 fish total. The one for two, yeah, trying to do math late in the day, and to get a 40 fish limit we'd have to have about a 78, the salmon season would have to have a 70, a 78 or 79 fish limit. So whatever the salmon limits are is going to control this fishery somewhat. That ratio is not changing, which is why to me including it in the range to get some more information and come back in just a couple of weeks seems appropriate. I just wanted to share a couple of things that are rattling through my brain.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:35] Thank you. David Sones, then Rebecca Lent.

David Sones [00:14:38] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I'm a little concerned too with going down to the 25 that we might, it shouldn't, that would increase our mortality discard level I believe. We'd be recording more discards that could affect our position in the IPHC, it could have an impact. I don't know if that analysis would draw that out, but that would be a concern for me also, but I also will not be supporting the amendment.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:14] Rebecca Lent, then Marci Yaremko.

Rebecca Lent [00:15:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just so that I can understand the implications of what we're proposing here, if incidental Pacific halibut catch regulations, I guess it's bycatch, I'm looking at the paper from the SAS Report, but here it says inseason action, unless modified through inseason action. Are we saying that we could actually modify the ratio as well as the plus 25, plus 35 inseason? But right here we're looking at a range of alternatives to look at to consider including post-release mortality, but whatever we adopt can we....how much flexibility do we have on what we change inseason? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:11] Anyone in particular you want to direct the question to? Or does anybody want to? Maybe I'll just see if Angela, because it's regarding management flexibility inseason, how that works?

Angela Forristall [00:16:31] Yeah, I can take a stab at that Mrs. Lent. You are correct that this could be modified by inseason. To my understanding, typically how that's been used in the past is to make inseason adjustments for this April 1 to May 15 fishery, but the language does indicate that there is that flexibility there.

Rebecca Lent [00:16:57] Sorry to be so dense. So we could inseason change the ratio as well as that plus number at the end?

Angela Forristall [00:17:04] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:12] Thank you. Marci you had your hand up next?

Marci Yaremko [00:17:14] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Maybe just a follow-up on David Sones's comment or question. I guess I'd look to the State of Washington. Do you collect information on halibut discards incidental to your salmon troll activities?

Heather Hall [00:17:38] Not sure about that. I mean they would be, if there was an observer on a salmon troll boat, that's where it would be collected.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:43] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:17:56] Thank you Vice-Chair. I won't support the motion, but only because I'm always in favor of keeping more options on the table. And I would rather, if I could offer an amendment to the amendment but I don't want to do that, but I would rather add the alternative that you put forward Marci into the range that was put forward by the SAS than to pull out the alternative that they came forward with just to see them all analyzed against each other. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:26] Any further discussion? I'm not seeing any so I will call the question on the motion to amend. The amendment is before you to modify Alternative 2. It is no longer 40, but 25 on the trip limit. All those in favor say "Aye".

Marci Yaremko [00:18:55] Aye.

Corey Ridings [00:18:55] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:58] Opposed?

Council [00:18:59] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:02] Abstentions?

Jennifer Quan [00:19:03] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:03] Executive Director Burden too close for me to call. Would you please call a roll call vote.

Merrick Burden [00:19:26] Okay, let's see I'm working from Voting Sheet Number 1. I'm calling this C.2 Amendment that was moved by Miss Yaremko. So let's see, starting from the top, Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:19:52] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:19:52] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:19:56] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:19:56] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:20:00] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:01] David Sones.

David Sones [00:20:01] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:01] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:20:08] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:08] Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:20:10] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:15] Jennifer Quan.

Jennifer Quan [00:20:18] Abstain.

Merrick Burden [00:20:21] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:20:25] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:25] Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:20:29] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:30] Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:20:34] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:34] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:20:36] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:20:39] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:20:40] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:20:42] Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:54] No.

Merrick Burden [00:20:54] And the motion to amend fails Mr. Vice-Chairman, and you do not need to vote.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:03] Thank you Executive Director Burden. Takes us back to the main motion as it appears on the screen before us. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:21:13] I would like to offer an amendment in the spirit of what Aja suggested. And it would merely be to add a alternative with the number 25. I don't know if you need me to dictate that or you can copy and paste and replace what 25 or 40 was as an additional alternative. That works for me.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:59] All right, that's clear to me but it's a little bit light. But I think if it's understood that we are adding a new alternative similar to the current Alternative 2 that replaces 40 with 25, then that language on the screen is accurate and complete?

Marc Gorelnik [00:22:17] I think there's common understanding here I hope, yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:22] All right, then I will look for a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Marc Gorelnik [00:22:28] I don't think I need to speak much to it. I think the notion here is to provide a wider range and we'll make our decision in April.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:40] Thank you very much. Questions for clarification on the motion to amend? David Sones.

David Sones [00:22:46] I see it's replacing 40, so there would be no 40 in the alternatives?

Pete Hassemer [00:22:56] No I.....as I said, let me have Marc explain it, it's his motion to amend.

Marc Gorelnik [00:23:05] The SAS alternative that was added with 40 would remain in the range. This would be to add a further alternative. The ratio would stay the same but the limit would be 25 instead of 40. I see Mr. Smith is puzzled.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:29] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:23:30] If I could, my understanding is it would add a fourth alternative that replaces 40 with 25.

Marc Gorelnik [00:23:38] Yes. Right. It's adding an additional alternative.

Heather Hall [00:23:40] Thank you.

Marc Gorelnik [00:23:41] It doesn't take anything away from what's already on the table.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:49] Okay, still making sure everybody's clear on this. Questions for clarification? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:23:55] Admittedly the slowest one on the Council here. I just reiterate that this actually just adds a fourth analysis, is that correct? Okay. I gotta watch Marc with both eyes so I just...(laughter)....

Pete Hassemer [00:24:13] Further questions for clarification? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:24:16] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Question for the maker of the amendment. Regarding your selection of the number 25, I'm looking at Attachment 1 and looking at what we've set this trip limit at historically and we have numbers down as low as 12. And acknowledging that many of our Chinook vessel limits are sometimes 40 fish, sometimes 20 fish, sometimes even 10 fish, I'm wondering how you reached the number 25?

Marc Gorelnik [00:24:56] Well, I think first of all we need to be realistic about what is reasonable to put on the table. And I think that someone smarter than me recently suggested the number 25 and I felt that was a reasonable outside range to provide a reasonable range for analysis. I don't think that it is reasonable to propose anything lower.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:32] Thank you. Any other questions for clarification? Not seeing any, any discussion on the motion? Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:25:42] I plan to support the motion, thank you Vice-Chair. I plan to support the motion, just acknowledging we can change things inseason and also this will provide us more information to think about and an additional chance for the SAS to comment about the alternative that you put forward Marci, in comparison to what they put forward in the range.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:07] Thank you. Further discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:26:11] Thank you Vice-Chair, and thank you Mr. Gorelnik for taking some friendly advice from the other side of the table. I support adding this and going forward with a wide range, and maybe by the time we come back to this in April we'll have a little better idea of what our salmon seasons might look like to help us make an informed decision. So I appreciate the approach we've come to on this one.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:36] Any other discussion? Not seeing any I will call the question on the motion to amend. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:26:48] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:51] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Takes us back to the main motion now as amended. Any further discussion on that? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:27:08] Thank you Vice-Chair. I feel like I'm talking a lot about a salmon item where I normally don't talk salmon. What I alluded to a few minutes ago, and it may or may not be possible because as we've been discussing under some halibut items, having the number reported on fish tickets. Wondering if, I know ODFW staff are probably going to throw things at me tonight, but wondering if NMFS, Council staff, State staffs can take a look and see if we have any information to inform how many vessels may be coming up against the current trip limit at what it is. You know, is it working or is the data showing that that limit is restrictive to folks? It may not be possible. I'm not even positive on ODFW fish tickets for salmon right now whether the number of halibut are there, but it was just a thought of maybe some additional data to inform a decision. I don't know that it needs to be a formal request but just a thought of my putting on my old data nerd GMT hat of can I have data to make a decision? I don't know if anybody else has thoughts on that or doesn't have staff or the data for that.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:27] All right, thank you. Appreciate that consideration but I'm wondering, are you implying something that would come back in April to be combined with the results of the public review or an analysis that would go out as pertains to this motion, what goes out for public review?

Lynn Mattes [00:28:49] Thank you Vice-Chair. My thought was if we have any information we could bring it back as part of this agenda item in April to help inform our decision. It may not be possible. It may not be the right process. But I was just informed, thanks to the interwebs, that ODFW does have a number of halibut on fish tickets. Yeah it was to not send that out for public review to bring that as some data to possibly inform our decision in April.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:17] All right, thank you. Just want to make clear on how it relates to the action we're voting on. So come back. Any further discussion on the motion as amended? Seeing no discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:29:37] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:39] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Once the typing is done I will ask.....we'll get our task screen refreshed there. And at this point there have been no inseason changes proposed, but I believe we have completed tasks 2 and 3. So as you think about any further discussion let me check-in with Angela on how we're doing here?

Angela Forristall [00:30:23] Hi Mr. Vice-Chair. Apologies if I missed it, but do think we still need to adopt restrictions for the fixed gear sablefish fishery?

Pete Hassemer [00:30:34] My apologies, I glanced over that one so. As I said, before we get back to further discussion, now let's commence our discussion on this agenda item. And it looks like Corey Niles has joined us and has his hand raised. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:30:52] Well I've got a motion if there's no discussion I'd be happy to make.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:00] I'm not seeing any hands to start it so let's have your motion.

Corey Niles [00:31:09] Excuse me. I move the Council adopt a final trip limit ratio of 75 pounds of Pacific halibut per 1,000 pounds of sablefish plus two additional Pacific halibut for the primary sablefish fishery north of Point Chehalis, Washington as recommended in Agenda Item C.2.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, March 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:32] Thank you. I followed along. That language on the screen looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Corey Niles [00:31:40] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:40] Okay, thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Aja Szumylo. Please speak your motion.

Corey Niles [00:31:47] I'll just speak briefly. As referenced there we thank the GAP and the GMT for their discussions on this as they put there the allowance for this sector went up this year from 50,000 to 70,000. And we're looking at some increases in the tier limits as well so the adjustment down to 75 sounds like a sensible place to begin and as was discussed in the other discussion of the other motion, this is something tracks closely inseason and can adjust or stop as we approach that 70,000 pounds.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:33] All right, thank you. Questions for the maker of the motion for clarification? Seeing no questions for clarification, discussion on the motion? Not seeing any hands there, so let's call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:32:53] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:56] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Now, first I'm going to ask if there's any hands for further discussion? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm going to check-in with Angela and see how we've done here?

Angela Forristall [00:33:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. There were no recommendations at this time for inseason halibut landing restrictions to the salmon troll fishery, but you did adopt a range of four alternatives for public review for that fishery and final landing limit ratio for the sablefish fishery, so you've completed your tasks.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:46] All right, thank you all for that work and that completes our work on this agenda item so I'll close it out and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

D. Cross Fishery Management Plan

~~1. United States Coast Guard Annual Report-- Cancelled~~

2. Marine Planning

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That finishes our reports and takes us to public comment, and I don't think we have any. Nope, we do not. So that takes us to Council action, which is before you. So with that I'll open the floor for discussion as appropriate or needed. Corey....John Ugoretz are you there?

John Ugoretz [00:00:29] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. Can you hear me?

Brad Pettinger [00:00:32] We can. Welcome.

John Ugoretz [00:00:34] Good morning. Just regarding Number 2 there in the cumulative impacts framework, I agree with what we've heard. I think pausing that document while we wait to hear for more information and see where things go at the federal level makes sense. No reason to do work that may not be needed. It will be a helpful document if it is needed and we can resume work on it when that time comes. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:13] Okay. Thank you John. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:01:16] Excuse me. Thanks Mr. Chair. I guess, yeah, the pause does make sense. I don't think it prevents people on their own from continuing to think about it. Just a couple of comments on in the presidential memo that Mike went over with the MPC Report. It calls for a couple of, and it uses the word comprehensive evaluation, comprehensive assessment and the read of many of us who've been following closely is it asks a lot of the same questions that are....you would think would ask some of the same questions that the cumulative impacts framework asks, that this Council has asked and stakeholders have asked, so there's definitely a connection there and I do...I just waiting to see, there's no timelines given on the presidential memo on what the timeline might be? So just pausing until we have more on that, that does make practical sense to me.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:29] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:02:37] Thanks Chair. I'll take a stab at the first one. Hearing what we heard today I think I would be in support of asking the MPC and the HC to standby for that suitable sea space for wind and tidal energy draft report. Just thinking about what has happened with wind energy, the speed with which that happened, I think a take-home there was just that we want to be involved and have fisheries at the table and not on the menu, wait that's backwards. Anyway, we want to eat fish, we want to have fisheries, and part of that is having fisheries concerns engaged at as early and often as possible. I heard the GAP say, and I hope I have this correct, but that there's concern about this and that a slowdown is wanted. Unfortunately, I think if we don't comment on that, that's not going to actually slow it down. It just means our concerns won't be taken into account as soon as desired. And I understand the Habitat Committee's concerns too. I get that. How you comment is usually made easier when you have a sort of a smaller sandbox to be talking about. But fundamentally, my concerns are about having fisheries information and voices included as early as possible. So I would suggest that we sort of allow the MPC to take a look at that when it comes out and make a decision if it falls outside of our usual sort of meeting processes to offer us a QR.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:28] Thank you Corey. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:04:32] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I think I largely agree with what Corey said. It's not our state, but having been one of the staff people that did contribute to our state's Marine Spatial Plan a number of years ago, I do think.....well, to try to phrase it a different way, I don't think the Council wants to ignore it and then be in a situation where we said we didn't have a chance to comment. Our Marine Spatial Plan I'm thinking of the robust engagement we got from our stakeholders, and a lot of us have Dale Beasley in our thoughts right now, but he comes to mind and Larry Thevik as folks that we're really engaged in helping. There was no imminent projects at the time but it was still an exercise where we learned more about where fisheries happened and where our habitats were, and et cetera, so I do see value in it. On the Habitat Committee's concern, I think Mike Conroy said it well. A specific part of it will be the data and analysis that's in the report that they provide and the feedback would be on that report. So I do think that there's a high likelihood there will be enough specifics there for folks to look into, but I think Corey your suggestion was have a look at it when it comes out and the Council can always decide that it doesn't want to send a letter because it was not specific enough.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:15] Thank you Corey. Thank you Corey. All right, seems reasonable. So, all right. Anything else? Kerry.

Kerry Griffin [00:06:28] Thank you Mr. Chair. That was a good discussion. I think that completes your business. I heard that the Council appreciates the work that's been done on that cumulative.....hold on.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:40] I see John Ugoretz' hand is up, so John?

John Ugoretz [00:06:43] No need Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:44] You sure? Okay, very good. Proceed. Kerry, whenever you're ready, oh, I'm sorry.

Kerry Griffin [00:06:57] Sorry, I thought you were telling him to proceed....(laughter).... Yeah, thank you. I think that wraps up your business for this. I heard the Council say they appreciate the work on the cumulative impacts framework, but there's no need right now to continue further work on that. It can be brought back forward at some point in the future if need be. And then regarding the California Energy Commission suitable sea space, just sort of wait and see what comes out. Staff can take a look at that with the Chairs as appropriate and make a plan at that time.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:38] Very good Kerry. Thank you.

Kerry Griffin [00:07:39] Thank you.

E. Salmon Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes all our reports. On my last check I didn't see any public comment on that. That's been confirmed, so will take us then to any Council discussion. There's no action on this item. It's the NMFS Reports. And we will start with Miss Dani Evenson. Dani.

Dani Evenson [00:00:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'd like to go back to the Tribal Report that was just provided in E.1.c. And first of all I want to echo, I support most if not all of Miss Quan's comments on that. And I wrestled with what I wanted to say about this because it does point its finger at Alaska. And if I understand the Quinault request as laid out in the letter, among the many of them, the Tribe is requesting that pertinent management agencies be notified of the stock status and the contribution of various fisheries to the total exploitation rate for something that happened in the past but is no longer occurring now in fisheries outside the jurisdiction of this Council. Zooming out a level, I think at its core this is really about concern for the conservation of the Gray's Harbor Fall Chinook stock and Washington Coast Chinook stocks in general. And perhaps it is with an eye towards avoiding the circumstance of this stock being subject to overfishing in the future. While I understand and even appreciate the concerns raised for the conservation of Washington Coastal Chinook stocks, which are indeed experiencing a downturn in productivity and the impacts that remote northern fisheries may have, the place for those discussions outlined by Miss Quan is at the Pacific Salmon Commission. As Miss Quan said, this is not an MSA problem right now. The status of the stock group has been a recent topic brought forward by the tribes at the Salmon Commission, at least in the U.S. table, for the U.S. and the Pacific Salmon Treaty. And I expect it's going to figure in prominently as negotiations continue. As Miss Quan said, Alaska has met all of its obligations under the 2019 Pacific Salmon Treaty agreement. And we have an additional incentive to meet all those obligations because the ESA coverage afforded by the Southeast Alaska BiOp, which was recently updated in 2024, requires us to do so and bad things happen if we don't. Lastly, I want to note that Alaska anticipates that the impact on Gray's Harbor Fall Chinook in Washington, coastal fall Chinook in general from Southeast Alaska fisheries has gone down in 2023 and 2024 because of reduced fisheries in August when this stock passes through waters off the coast of Alaska, and I do expect that trend to continue. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:31] Thank you very much. Further discussion? Looking around. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:03:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. First time at the table this meeting. Appreciated Miss Ridings' question. The STT doesn't calculate exploitation rates for this stock to the best of my knowledge. I believe they just get those from the Chinook Technical Committee of the Pacific Salmon Commission. And there might be some flybys on how different things are subtracted and added, but I don't think the....the STT is just reporting what they get from the Chinook Technical Committee.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:19] Thank you. Look around and see if there's any other questions. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:04:28] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss Quan and Miss Evenson for your thoughts on what we have heard today. I think I have a question, I think it's for Miss Quan. But looking at the request here that the PFMC coordinate with NMFS as well as the Alaska region and the North Pac, you spoke very briefly to say that there was some coordination, but also that we don't have a good process for this. And perhaps I'm exposing my own ignorance here, but if it would be possible for you to outline a little bit better how you are responding to this request to work perhaps better and more closely with the other regional counterparts to move forward and ensure that this mistake around the data, communication of this, making sure we're not overfishing moving forward is occurring. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:29] Jen.

Jennifer Quan [00:05:32] Yeah, thanks for that. And this is, you know, how we work across Pacific Councils with mixed stocks or shared stocks, I guess, is the this. And we're seeing just given, we're seeing nationally that challenge in the Atlantic and elsewhere, where we had clear lines before and with as things are changing and moving and new things are popping up places we didn't expect them before, we have to develop that. But in this particular case are processes that work between Councils. For salmon, though, we theoretically already have that set up, especially because of how these fish travel through Canada. And so ultimately the Pacific Salmon Treaty and that process there is the table for addressing these issues. For different species, the Council, if it's an MSA issue or becomes an MSA issue, would be the place to do it.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:44] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:06:54] Thanks Vice-Chair. Thanks Miss Quan. Just in follow-up to that, you noted right now that we don't have a good process. And I don't suspect that you meant that as a complete universal statement in respect to what we're talking about here today. And we also heard from the report that there is a request to do more and do better, it's also falling short. So just a question about how you see this getting better through the existing processes and what that might look like and what the agency can do, recognizing that it is primarily caught not in West Coast waters, but it is in our FMP and we are responsible for its management?

Jennifer Quan [00:07:40] Yeah, thanks. I think it goes beyond the agency just to do better, it's all of us will need to do better. So with the upcoming salmon, or the renegotiations will be the table for us to get together and continue to improve the situation together. And that's, that's the best I can say on that.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:07] Thank you. Any further questions or discussion on this agenda item? Not seeing hands I'm going to turn back to Angela and see if there's anything else we need here. There was no action to take. Angela.

Angela Forristall [00:08:25] That's correct Mr. Vice-Chair. The Council did discuss the reports that were provided to you today so your work on this item is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:36] All right, thank you. I think with that we can close out this agenda item.

2. Review of 2024 Fisheries and Summary of 2025 Stock Forecasts

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, that completes our reports and the public comment, takes us to Council discussion and action. I'll look around to see if anybody cares to initiate the discussion here. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:18] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I wanted to start just by thanking the STT for the amount of work they do every January, February to get us the review document, the pre-season document, and I think this was an especially tough year. Some staff changes for some agencies unrelated to everything that's going on with the federal government, and then just the uncertainty that's slowly set in there. But as always they did an amazing job to pull a lot of information together. They had the support of a long list of state, tribal and federal staff that work on gathering that information and getting it to us today. I did want to say a little more about the OPI coho forecast. I attended the meeting of the technical team that produced that forecast last month and listened to the discussion on the forecast produced by the forecast model, which was run exactly as it was in 2024, and during that meeting I heard the scientist who know these coho stocks and the forecast model better than anyone express concerns with the model performance based on how the model was handling changes to relationships between ocean indicators in the most recent years compared to the last 25 plus years that are used in the model. I also heard that the technical team was unclear on how much flexibility they had to explore changes to improve model performance within the approved methodology framework. I've heard similar but broader scale concerns from experts on ocean conditions about changing relationships between ocean indicators and what those changes mean for salmon during presentations at the Pacific Salmon Commission postseason meeting in January and through NOAA Summary of Ocean Ecosystem Indicators Reports for both 2023 and 2024. One of the benefits identified by almost everyone when the new forecast methodology for OPIH coho was reviewed in November 2023 was the incorporation of ocean indicators to predictions instead of just relying on smolt releases and jack returns like the previous model. With the incorporation of the ocean indicators, the new model had lower error rates than the old method, specifically lower mean absolute percent error, as MAPE as you heard it referred to in the ODFW/DFW Report. Because of these concerns with recent changes to ocean conditions and their potential effects on model performance, subsequent to the OPITT meeting, Oregon and Washington staff who participate on OPITT explored different approaches to running the model that could decrease MAPE within the approved model framework while considering the same suite of ocean indicators. Of the methods evaluated, the method that weights years differently across time performed the best. This better performing method weights recent years, which are more reflective of conditions experienced by fish that will return in 2025 more heavily than years further in the past and improve model performance as measured by MAPE. As I said earlier, in my mind this is an even smaller change than a data range change which does not require full methodology under Council Operating Procedure 15. This method weights more recent data, which should be more relevant to current conditions more heavily than older data, while still maintaining the older data in the range of what the model analyzes. As I also said earlier, I agree that the methodology should be revisited through the normal cycle this year so that what flexibility there is within the approved framework can be better identified, and so that other things identified for potential investigation back when the methodology was reviewed in 2023 can be considered. And I fully support the use of the forecast brought forward by Oregon and Washington for fishery planning in 2025. I believe it does not require full methodology review and believe that it does represent the

best scientific information available as we begin analyzing fishery alternatives in the coming days. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:54] Thank you Kyle. Other discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:04:04] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I want to follow-up on a question or a point made by, through a question made by Miss Yaremko. We're looking at a ratio here in the Sacramento forecast of 8.6 forecast adults per jack, which coincidentally is exactly what we saw last year. So it's not looking past into past years. The year before that, and I'm not talking about forecast here, I'm talking about actual post-season numbers, the year before that the ratio was 20. The ratio before that, the year before that was 15. Year before that 23, et cetera. And I'm raising this not to call into question the forecast we have here that we have before us, that is the best scientific information available, and I'm not suggesting you need to go back and look at that. What I'm suggesting is that this is an extremely conservative number and that for the purpose of planning seasons, you know, obviously one option I think folks are considering is no fishing, but I think that the other options need to take advantage, at least one of them needs take advantage of the forecast and the guidance from NMFS. So it's.....I find it, I don't know what the actual post-season number will be but we'll find out obviously a year from now, but it is a very, it's an exceedingly conservative number historically.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:44] Thank you. Any other discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:05:55] Getting warmed up here. Thanks Vice-Chair. I just have a few comments regarding the OPIH. Just listening to conversation today and reading documents and thinking this over it seems like the WDFW/ODFW Report is coming from a really good place, but I am having some heartburn with it. Across the coast we have similar levels of variability in our forecasts. This isn't specific to this forecast. And we have processes in place that ensure the integrity of the science so we can both adhere to the law, but like more importantly, that we can guarantee to our interest holders and fishermen that the science that we're using is the best that we can have, that it was produced transparently and done in an inclusive way. We'll never have as much science as we want, that is just so clear. And it unfortunately sounds like we may be heading into a world where we have less. In my eyes, in that world, the integrity of how we're including science in our management becomes even more important. A full method review would have meant the inclusion of folks from Idaho, the Tribes, NFMS, and California, none of who were part of the process that led to this report. That is no shade to the wonderful scientists that worked there and presented to us earlier in the day. I'm sure they are absolutely top notch. But coming in last minute around the process, and the SSC didn't even have a chance to look at it, is just raising a lot of alarm bells for me. And again, especially this is in the context of similarly variable forecasts around the coast that are going to be very likely very difficult for many of our fishermen. So reflecting on some of the earlier conversation and thinking about our COP's in regard to maintaining the integrity of our processes, what makes it exceptional? And if so, like what is the benchmark for that exceptionalness? And how do we know that it's being fairly applied across our states? The report itself, I think it said it's a modest change, but it's also a change that's recommended to go through methodology review again. So those are at least somewhat contradictory in my mind when I read that. So yeah, I have some heartburn with this and just wanted to share it with the Council.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:24] Thank you. Jennifer Quan.

Jennifer Quan [00:08:30] Thank you Vice-Chair. I just wanted to recommend support of the state's proposal. From our perspective we think the science is compelling. We do support methodology review for verification and for consideration of this approach into the future and don't see a reason to oppose implementation in 2025. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:02] Thank you. Other discussion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:06] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just want to acknowledge the testimony of Barry Day and the real circumstances that have been in play in the Klamath Basin, and just wanted to highlight how restrictive that de minimis provision is going to be on shaping fisheries south of Falcon. all the way around we're looking at very, very small numbers of fish to share across ocean and inland fisheries in Oregon and California. I'm pretty sure that's going to be our pinch point. And I want to also acknowledge Mr. Gorelnik's comments on the jacks for Sacramento and the forecasting and the potential that perhaps that the forecast is somewhat conservative. But I think at the end of the day that probably isn't going to matter a whole lot in light of the circumstances on the Klamath. And so I know there are a lot of folks that want to dig deeper into the questions on the Sacramento, but I think realistically speaking we need to face the reality that circumstances on the Klamath are very dire. And at the same time I think it's also fair to acknowledge some optimism here in the sense that Klamath is very early in its phase of recovery and we see some encouraging signs. And I think we do have quite a bit of optimism with some of the early signals about fish moving all the way up into Oregon and, you know, the system recovering. So I don't feel like it's all doom and gloom, and I just wanted to take that opportunity to make those remarks. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:06] Thank you Marci. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:11:14] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And I think my question is for Mr. Adicks. We've had a couple of points here in the discussion where the topic of kicking this to methodology review has come up, and so as you have in your joint report proposed this for methodology review, I'm wondering if you could help us understand if you have a vision for what that is? Is it specific to the decaying weighted approach or is it broader than that and exploring the problem more holistically to try to come up with a more permanent fix if that is indeed different?

Kyle Adicks [00:11:55] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Director Burden. My vision isn't....it would be specifically to bring this adjustment to the existing model back for another methodology review. It would be a little broader. There were some topics identified back in November of 2023 that were suggested for further exploration. We didn't try to dive into that the first summer after the new model was implemented before we even knew how it performed in a single year, so there were some of those issues. There could be other ideas that come forward. And I presume we'd come at it with the same framework, whether we start looking at individual components like was suggested back in 2023 of the aggregate. I don't have a clear vision for what all that is, but it wouldn't be just to take this single adjustment to what I think still fits within the method that was already approved. It wouldn't just be to bring that back through the process.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:59] Thank you. Look around, at some point if we're winding down on discussion, we do need a motion to adopt the forecasts and ACLs. John North, I think I saw your hand going up.

John North [00:13:16] Yeah, I was up and down, but yeah I do have a motion whenever you're ready.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:23] It appears to be on the screen before us so why don't you go ahead with that motion.

John North [00:13:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I move that the Council adopt the 2025 Stock Abundance Forecast, Acceptable Biological Catches, and Annual Catch Limits as presented in Agenda Item E.2, Supplemental Attachment 3, Preseason Report 1, with the following exception: For the Oregon Production Index Hatchery Forecast, that's coho, adopt the abundance forecast of 493,640 fish recommended in the Agenda Item, E.2.a, Supplemental WDFW and ODFW Report 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:07] Thank you. As I followed along the language on the screen appears accurate and complete, do you agree?

John North [00:14:16] Yes, I was just debating if we should insert the word 'coho', but I think OPIH is synonymous with that, so it should function so.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:27] All right, thank you. I'll look around and see if there's a second to that motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

John North [00:14:36] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I did have a few comments primarily on the alternate OPIH portion of the motion since that's been talked about. I thought it'd be helpful, we kind of dove right in, but I thought it'd be helpful to just talk a little bit about the OPITT process because not everybody's involved with that. But that's like an annual data gathering process and forecasting meeting that's held in February each year where all the staff get all the pertinent data together, you know, relative to OCN and OPIH coho forecasts, and then it's presented and discussed and the recent meeting was well attended. There was good discussions, but once we got to that point where the actual 2025 OPIH forecast, you know rolled out, then several individuals, as somebody mentioned, I think it was Mr. Adicks with decades of experience forecasting Columbia River salmon runs, kind of picked up on a few metrics that were mentioned in Report 1 and you know things didn't seem right. I'd also point out that the relationship between OCN and OPIH coho has been extremely strong for the last 10 years with a R squared of .93. So to have one forecast go in one direction and one the other was quite odd. So as Mr. Adicks described, you know these observations caused this concern and that led the modelers to take another look at things which they described in the supplemental report. And I think they outline what to me appears to be an improvement of the current improve.....an improvement to the current methodology so I support that revision and the subsequent forecast for a couple of reasons, and well two especially. Back in November of 23' when we, when this came before us, I supported this new ARIMA Model because I've always been a big fan of multi-model approaches for salmon, and I think that's the way to go. And I also wanted to provide a more adaptable framework that could adjust to changing conditions and allow the modelers the most flexibility to use the best forecast that they can come up with and I think that's what we've done. And also this new revision has a lower MAPE, so I think it's an appropriate modification. And as I mentioned earlier, I don't think it's a significant change since it's still using the same format structure to the model, the same covariance, the same input years. And finally, this is important to me, but with this new weighting

approach and the resulting forecast, it makes sense, and I think that's important. My experience has shown that when you see something predicting all, you know, a lot of things you've never seen before you should take notice and that's what happened here and, you know, we already know that this brood has done okay because it has 50,000 jacks have already survived, which is above the 10 and 20-year averages, so it's not a bad brood. And so I think this approach brings some of the metrics back in line and it makes sense. So I support this revision outlined in the letter, and I think it's an interim step and we should support including this work and other things like it in the methodology review process. And finally, I'd really like to thank the OPITT Modeling Team for all the work. They did this during a really busy time, which was much appreciated. and also thanks to STT for their current work. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:55] Thank you John. Questions for the maker of the motion for clarification? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Seeing no hands for discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:19:21] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:21] Opposed?

Corey Ridings [00:19:24] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:25] Abstentions? The motion passes with one no vote. Thank you very much. Before I ask Angela what else we need to do, I will first look around the table to see if there's any further discussion here? I believe that was our charge. So Angela how have we done?

Angela Forristall [00:20:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes you passed a motion that adopted your stock abundance forecasts, ABCs, and ACLs, and also did consider that WDFW/ODFW Report. So your work on this agenda item is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:16] All right, thank you. One last look around, make sure there's nothing else to discuss on this agenda item. And I'm not seeing any hands so we'll close out this agenda item and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

3. Identify Management Objectives and Preliminary Definition of 2025 Management Alternatives

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] Now that completes all our reports and the public comment. I got some intel here that says we do not need a break. I think people are ready to move forward with necessary motions, but before we get to those let's make sure all our discussion regarding the reports in this item is taken care of. So are there any questions or discussion that needs to occur? It doesn't look like it. I would be happy to entertain any motion and to remind you what we need to do. The tasks are on the screen there before you. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:49] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion for north of Falcon fisheries.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:56] All right. I'm anticipating that will show up on the screen.

Kyle Adicks [00:01:05] I move that the Council adopt for Salmon Technical Team compilation and analysis the proposed initial salmon management alternatives for the 2025 non-Indian ocean fisheries between Cape Falcon and the U.S.-Canada border as developed by the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and described in Agenda Item E.3.e, Supplemental SAS Report 1, March 6th, 2025, with the following modifications. For the North of Falcon non-Indian fishery, add quotas of 130,000 marked coho in Alternative 1. 115,000 marked coho in Alternative 2. And 100,000 marked coho in Alternative 3. Calculate all commercial, recreational, and subarea allocations consistent with the Fishery Management Plan defined sharing throughout Tables 1 and 2. On Table 1, Commercial Troll Management Alternatives, Page 2 for Alternative 3, adjust non-Indian commercial troll TAC to 48,750. Adjust the May 16th through June 29th catch limit to 24,375. And on Page 4 for Alternative 3, adjust the July 1 through September 22nd catch limit to 24,375. For Table 2, Recreational Management Alternatives, on Page 15 under Alternative 1, add to Number 4, "Trade may be considered at the April Council meeting". For the U.S.-Canada border to Cape Alava/Neah Bay subarea: Under Alternative 1, add a June 21 through June 30th season, two salmon daily limit, only Chinook may be retained. Adjust the starting date for the all-species season to July 1, and change the daily limit to two salmon daily limit, delete of which only one may be a Chinook. For Cape Alava to Queets River, the La Push subarea: For Alternative 1, add June 21 through June 30th season, two salmon daily limit, only Chinook may be retained. And adjust the starting date for the all-species season to July 1, change daily limit to two salmon daily limit, delete of which only one may be a Chinook. For Queets River to Leadbetter Point, the Westport subarea: Under Alternative 1, add June 21st through June 27th season, one salmon daily limit, only Chinook may be retained. Adjust the starting date for the all-species season to June 28th. And for Leadbetter Point to Cape Falcon, the Columbia River subarea: For Alternative 1, add June 21 through June 27 season, one salmon daily limit, only Chinook may be retained. Adjust the starting date for the all-species season to June 28. And for Alternative 3, change the daily limit to all salmon, two salmon per day, no more than one of which may be a Chinook.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:46] Thank you. Can't see it all on the screen, but as I followed along everything there seemed accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Kyle Adicks [00:03:53] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:53] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion.

Kyle Adicks [00:03:58] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks to the SAS as well as to the STT and the Council staff for all their work coordinating getting a package in front of us today. It was late in the game before we were able to dial in a coho quota, so these quotas needed to be added to what the SAS brought forward. The other changes, the commercial change to the TAC, that was just a calculation error as the different alternatives were put into the package, so that's just to correct that. The recreational management alternatives, the addition of the trade language is just to match what was already there for the commercial troll fishery, and then the June seasons with Chinook-only retention, those came from the SAS this morning. It was something, an idea that came up after the package was done yesterday, so just adding some changes to that out of the gate. Again, thanks to everybody for all your help. It's been a frantic couple of days to get this together.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:57] All right, thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Seeing no questions, any discussion on the motion? No discussion, I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:05:13] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:16] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Kyle. Any other parts of the coast? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:33] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I am ready with a motion for south of Falcon.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:39] All right, I believe that's on the screen now. Go ahead.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:43] Thank you. I move that the Council adopt for Salmon Technical Team compilation and analysis the Proposed Initial Salmon Management Alternatives for the 2025 non-Indian ocean fisheries between Cape Falcon, Oregon, and the U.S.-Mexico border as developed by the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and described in Agenda Item E.3.e, Supplemental SAS Report 1, March 6th, 2025, with the corrections as noted on the floor and with direction to set the Sacramento River fall Chinook inriver recreational share to 15% of the total allowable harvest in each of the alternatives.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:28] Thank you Marci. That language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Marci Yaremko [00:06:35] Yes I do.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:35] Great. Is there a second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:40] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just want to thank the Salmon Advisory Subpanel for this first cut, and want to note that they were precautionary in setting their alternatives as a starting point. Want to acknowledge that and recognize that I think we're starting in a good place. I want to especially acknowledge appreciation for the California SAS's effort to

put forward a No-Fishing Alternative in Alternative 3, which is consistent with the recommendations from CDFW that we put forward for real consideration a No-Fishing Alternative south of Falcon. I also want to flag that it's already been a long week but there's more to go. I think we'll be needing to make considerable refinements to these starting places. But I also want to note the work that's underway on the regulatory text that is part of this package. There's been a lot going on in the background. I want to particularly thank National Marine Fisheries Service for getting us that draft text early to begin review and note that we've included quite a number of changes. I want to flag the incorporation of the Coastal Chinook Framework into the regulatory text on the commercial measures and building in the precautionary management strategies designed to keep realized catches to the projections for both sport and commercial fisheries. So that's taken a lot of legwork in the background. We have yet to prosecute fisheries under this new framework, so appreciate the attention that's been given to making sure that we are building a regulatory framework that is as we intended. So, I also want to acknowledge that with the closures off California the past two years we are intending to proceed with caution, and at least this first attempt starts us on the right path. So I want to thank the work of the SAS again. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:13] All right, thank you Marci. Any questions to the maker of the motion for clarification? John North.

John North [00:09:23] Thank you Vice-Chair. Before I speak to the Oregon piece of the motion, I did have a question. I was wondering if Miss Yaremko could you kind of walk us through the origin of the 15%? I'm a little slow and new to this, but what's the background on that?

Marci Yaremko [00:09:44] Sure thing. So when Sacramento fall Chinook are at high abundance, or relatively high abundance, the model works to set aside 14 and a half percent of the inriver run size to the inland fishery. That's kind of default as how the model works under more normal circumstances. When we get down at levels of low abundance, that assignment of that 14 and a half percent of the inriver run size is too big, and in fact then puts a good chunk of the harvestable surplus into the inland fishery. So instead when we're at these kind of low levels, we have the ability to override that default and use a more realistic expectation of inriver harvest. And that expectation of inriver harvest, the way we've evaluated that is by looking historically at the ratio of the inland catch to the ocean catch over time. So looking at years past through the entirety of the early time series, the inriver fishery took on average about 15% of the overall total harvest. In more recent years that number is a little lower, more, you know, nine-ish percent. But it's our belief that setting aside 15% of the harvestable surplus for an inriver fishery to be prosecuted is a reasonable projection of what we'd expect, acknowledging too that the decisions on what the inriver fishery will look like completely the purview of the Fish and Game Commission.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:51] Thank you. Any other questions for clarification? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Seeing.....John, did you want to raise your hand?

John North [00:12:06] I did want to speak to the Oregon portion if possible. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, I would also, too, like to thank the Salmon Advisory Subpanel members for pulling these alternatives together and working late to do that. For Oregon, the alternatives represent a first look to try and pull something together and work within the various management constraints and the distribution of past catch at Klamath and Sacramento fall Chinook impacts so, you know, this is our first attempt to consider the season preferences that we heard at our ocean salmon industry group meeting last week. I anticipate going forward that, you know, we'll require more tweaks and

modifications as we learn more about the limiting stocks. I appreciate the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Report and the attention it raises to the dire situation that we're facing. I acknowledge, you know, the California recommendation for an alternative to have no harvest south of Falcon, but given this is our first opportunity for STT to run through the numbers and the analysis of the proposed fisheries, I'd like to, you know, take that opportunity and look at the outputs first, and we'll work from that in the following days. And then I also want to thank NMFS for the guidance letter and I understand the concern about the Klamath and Sacramento stocks. They are in tough shape and Oregon shares the concern and I think we've worked hard in recent years to do our best to design fisheries with minimal impacts but also trying to access the more abundant stocks we have along the Oregon coast and the coho. So I appreciate everybody's work on the SAS and your crafting of these initial seasons and we'll continue on. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:06] Thank you John. Further discussion? Comments? Not seeing any I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:14:21] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:21] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. David Sones.

David Sones [00:14:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I do have a motion for the treaty ocean alternatives.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:42] And it looks like it's on the screen before us so go ahead.

David Sones [00:14:44] She's got it on the screen for me. So I move the Council adopt for STT analysis the following initial Treaty Ocean Troll Management Measures. The Tribes Alternative 1 is 55,000 Chinook and 50,000 coho. Alternative 2 is 45,000 Chinook and 37,500 coho. Alternative 3 is 35,000 Chinook and 20,000 coho. The Alternatives consist of the May 1 through June 30th Chinook directed fishery in July start date for the all-species fishery, Chinook and coho. Season structure with regard to the closing date is still under discussion among the tribes. The Chinook quota should be evenly split between the two time periods. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:45] Thank you. I followed along. The language on the screen looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

David Sones [00:15:51] Correct.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:52] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Virgil Moore. Please speak to your motion.

David Sones [00:15:57] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Glad to have this here. There's a lot of negotiating going on in the back room so I really appreciate them getting this out. Now I know we're kind of crunched with modeling time, and we've emphasized that from the Council level. And I think they did a good job getting it together for us when they were having to deal with some difficult, difficult agreements there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:30] Thanks. Let me look around and see if there's any questions regarding the motion for clarification? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Not seeing any discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:16:48] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:50] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you David. Okay, with that our task list is up there. Before I check-in with Angela we have, I believe, completed Step 1. And my interpretation was Part 2 inseason action was also addressed in the SAS Report but let me check-in with Angela. How are we doing?

Angela Forristall [00:17:26] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. That is correct. You've completed your work on 1 and 2. And the STT will now begin modeling based on those reports presented so you're complete on this action.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:41] All right. Before I close out the agenda item, one more scan around the room. Any last comments or discussion? I'm not seeing any. We'll close this agenda item and I'll pass the gavel back to our Chair.

4. Recommendations for 2025 Management Alternative Analysis

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our public comment and takes us to discussion. We can....there may have been some further questions that have come up. And again, if there is no guidance to provide at this point in time then we will keep this agenda item open into tomorrow. So let me look around and see if there's hands. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:24] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Is Dr. O'Farrell available?

Pete Hassemer [00:00:30] I hope he is. Dr. O'Farrell, are you there?

Michael O'Farrell [00:00:36] I'm here.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:37] Great, thank you. If I may, I'm hoping maybe you can review with us the impacts of the alternatives to Klamath fall, which I expected to be constraining in this package. And I'm looking on page 27 and I'm looking at Alts 1, 2, and 3 and all are within the constraints imposed by the FMP under a 10% exploitation rate. Maybe you can explain why that is? Thank you.

Michael O'Farrell [00:01:25] Through the Chair. Yes, I mean it's very early and we're still trying to learn as much as we can about what these patterns mean. I did some looking at this today, too, because other people have mentioned this. And it's, I will say that there is quite a bit of shaping in the alternatives to stay away from some high impact areas in the, you know, the peak months in the summer. There's some early season fisheries and, you know, there seemed like to me, and I wasn't there of course with the SAS, so it looked like there was some thought about, you know, trying to stretch out some kind of fishing, you know, by not going to the areas that are most expensive in terms of impacts. That's my current understanding of it right now. I mean we have....we've only done this one model run and we're going to learn more as we move forward here and continue to look into it.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:44] Thank you.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:48] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I have another question, but not for Michael.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:57] Go ahead with it.

Marci Yaremko [00:03:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to mention that I had an opportunity to meet with the California SAS this afternoon about some of the inputs that were included based on our motion yesterday regarding Sacramento fall Chinook, specifically the motion that specified to set the Sacramento River recreational impacts at 15% of the total harvestable surplus. And in my discussion with the SAS this afternoon, they have all conveyed to me that they are interested in seeing something different in one of these alternatives so that a river recreational share is assigned based on the default out of the model instead of fixing the input at 15%. And I was hoping I might be able to call George Bradshaw up. We had this two hour discussion, but I would like to, if I may, give him the opportunity to explain a little further. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:34] Sure. George.

George Bradshaw [00:04:46] Good afternoon Council, Chair, Miss Yaremko. You know I think that there's a lot of questions early in this salmon strategy process of coming up with these season dates, access along our coast. I think it's no secret to anybody that our stocks are not doing well, especially in California. They're rather limiting to say the least. You know there's a new framework that has been, you know, brought on to the fisheries in California that we're still trying to rattle to the ground and figure out. And there was guidance on the floor, you know, recommending a deviation from the change of, you know, status quo for that Sacramento fall-run stock in the harvest model. Since it is still early and since we are still trying to figure out a lot of different problems as well, you know, we recommended that we would have one alternative be status quo and, you know, for that harvest model output it falls in line with the guidance of this Council for public transparency, the ability to have public review. We're still in the early process where we have three alternatives that we're going to run through the public process and come back in April. We don't want to jump ahead of ourselves. Maybe this other way is better at the end, but our recommendation was to have one of the three alternatives with that status quo so that it left it open for public input through this process.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:31] Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:06:33] Thank you Vice-Chair, and thanks George. Could you....status quo is sort of ambiguous to people around the table here, can you explain what that means in terms of numbers?

George Bradshaw [00:06:45] Yeah, thank you for the question. You know I don't think the request is really about the numbers in our view. You know the request is that it's the way that this process has been ran for a long time. We've had one other time, to my knowledge, where we've deviated from that and it was probably the best decision made at the time. It's probably why we went through with it. But my understanding was that it was later in the process and we're past that three alternative step for public review. And like I said, I am frustrated at times with the process that seems slow here, but it is what this process is for and it's meant to be able to have public input and public review through this process and that's the sole reason why we're asking. But that default Marc, what you're speaking to is, you know, a set historical average of around, you know, 14 and a half percent of escapement. You know and then that kicks into amount of fish for inland harvest so that it leaves fish available for inland harvest.

Marc Gorelnik [00:07:59] All right, so just that means increasing the river share of the harvest to 14 and a half percent, or whatever percent of the escapement.

George Bradshaw [00:08:10] Yeah, that's the way.....

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:10] Did I understand that?

George Bradshaw [00:08:11] Yeah, so yes, that's the way that harvest model, you know, historically runs, yeah.

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:15] Okay. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:15] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:08:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just to clarify, the 14 and a half percent is from the inriver run size, it's not the escapement. So I just want to make sure that we're all clear on what the.....and this is again the default in the model. As you heard in the CDFW Report earlier in the week and as came out in the motion yesterday that the direction was to fix. Instead of using that default, fix the percentages at 15% assigned to the inriver harvest of the total harvestable surplus, so if I may, I have a question for George? Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Do you have a recommendation, George, on which of the three alternatives you would like to revert back to the default?

George Bradshaw [00:09:19] Through the Chair, thanks Miss Yaremko. You know I think from our conversations earlier it'd make the most sense to have that in Alternative 2.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:35] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:36] All right, thank you George.

George Bradshaw [00:09:40] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:40] Other questions or discussion? All right, let me just verify then there is no guidance to provide at this time in any of these? Not seeing any discussion here, are we done today and we will just pause our work on this agenda item and come back tomorrow when we're ready to deliver guidance? Angela.

Angela Forristall [00:10:15] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do appreciate everyone taking in the report today and spending some time with it to develop guidance and returning tomorrow when everyone's had a bit more time to digest. Sounds like a good plan to me.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:31] All right, thank you. Then at this point I will pause on this agenda item.....(AGENDA ITEM PAUSED FOR THE DAY)..... When we paused on E.4 yesterday we had gone through the STT Report and some public comment, all our reports, and initiated discussion. Gave everyone some time over the evening, the night, to think about that. So let's continue with that discussion and any guidance. We were looking for guidance for the next model. Anybody have thoughts, ideas on where we should go with this? Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:11:16] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I do have guidance for the STT.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:24] All right, let's.....looks like it's on the screen, go ahead.

Kyle Adicks [00:11:35] Thank you. This is guidance in relation to Agenda Item E.4.a, yesterday's STT report, March 8th, 2025. Implement the following changes for the north of Falcon non-Indian fishery. Adjust quotas in Alternative 1 to 122,500 Chinook and 102,000 marked coho. Calculate all commercial, recreational, and subarea allocations consistent with Fishery Management Plan defined sharing throughout Tables 1 and 2. Adjust quotas in Alternative 3 to 92,500 Chinook and 90,000 marked coho. Calculate all commercial, recreational, and subarea allocations consistent with Fishery Management Plan defined sharing through Tables 1 and 2.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:21] Kyle, can we pause there for a second? Maybe I heard wrong, you, at the top of the marked coho you said 102,000.

Kyle Adicks [00:12:30] 120,000, sorry.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:32] All right, thanks.

Kyle Adicks [00:12:36] On Table 1 the Commercial Management Alternative on Page 3, add the following sentence to the paragraph that references vessels fishing.....I'm trying to scroll on my own screen....."Vessels fishing south of Leadbetter Point for delivery to points north of Leadbetter Point, vessels must notify WDFW at 360-249-1215 prior to crossing the Leadbetter Point line with area fish total Chinook, coho, and halibut catch aboard and destination with approximate time of delivery". On Table 2, the Recreational Management Alternatives beginning on Page 15. For the Neah Bay Subarea: Edit the second sentence of season rules to read, "all salmon except coho June 21st to June 30th, two salmon per day". For the Cape Alava to Queets River, LaPush Subarea: Alternative 1, edit the second sentence of season rules to read, "all salmon except coho June 21st through June 30th, two salmon per day". And remove the October 7th through 11th season and add the quota for that period back into the subarea guideline for the main season. And in Alternative 2 remove October 1 through 4 fishery and add that quota for that period back into the subarea guideline for the main season. For the Queets River to Leadbetter Point, Westport Subarea: Alternative 1, edit the second sentence of season rules to read, "all salmon except coho June 21st through June 27th, one salmon per day". And for the Leadbetter Point to Cape Falcon, Columbia River Subarea: Alternative 1, edit the second sentence of season to read, "all salmon except coho June 21st through June 27th, one salmon per day". So a lot of that is just cleaning up some rules. The commercial thing is to put something very obvious in the rules that's already there to make it clear that when you cross that Leadbetter Point line you have to call in and report what you have. The Alternative 1 and Alternative 3 quota reductions are to make sure we have alternatives that are in reality for what we have to fix with inside and outside fisheries north of Falcon. That's my guidance for the day.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:04] All right, thank you. First thing, I'm used to having Dr. O'Farrell here. I believe we're still filtering this all through him before it gets to the STT. Dr. O'Farrell, do you have any questions on that guidance?

Michael O'Farrell [00:15:21] No, I don't have any questions at this time.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:24] All right, thank you very much. Anyone else around the table? I'm not seeing any. Further guidance? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:15:39] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm prepared to offer some guidance that should magically appear on the screen here.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:04] It may not have arrived.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:17] All right, let me pause.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:20] Okay.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:21] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:23] And there's no priority to order here. Each state is equally important. I'm going to look over to Oregon and see if they're ready with theirs.

John North [00:16:35] Yeah, Oregon is prepared to provide some guidance this morning. Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So regarding Agenda Item E.4, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 8th, 2025, beginning with the ODFW Commercial Management Alternatives in Table 1. Alternative 1, under Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border. Please replace Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border with Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain. Replace April 15th through May 31 with April 10 through May 31. Under Alternative 3, replace Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border with Humbug Mountain to Oregon-California border. And then for Cape Falcon to Heceta Bank Line, Alternative 3, replace June 1 to 30 with April 15th to 30, and remove July 11 through 31. For Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain under Alternative 1, replace 50 coho per vessel with 75 coho per vessel per landing week. Under Alternative 2, replace June 1 through 5, 12 through 16, 26 through 30, with June 15 through 30. And replace same as Alternate 1 with same as Alternate 1 except 50 coho per vessel per landing week. Under Alternative 3, remove May 1 through 31, replace the 5,000 coho quota with 7,500 coho quota. Replace the same as Alternate 1 with same as Alternate 1 except for 25 coho per vessel per landing week. Moving to Table 2, under the ODFW Recreational Management Alternatives, that's page 17, for Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain, under Alternative 1, replace March 15th through May 15th with March 15th through May 31. Add area Humbug Mountain to Oregon-California border with an Alternative 1 of May 1, season of May 1 through June 4, open seven days per week, all salmon except coho, two fish per day. Chinook minimum size limit 24 inches total length. See gear restrictions and definitions. And then under Alternative 2, same area, add May 15th through June 4th with the same regulations as the prior bullet. I think that covers it.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:21] All right, thank you John. First, let me turn to Dr. O'Farrell. Do you have any questions Mike?

Michael O'Farrell [00:19:30] No questions. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:33] All right, thank you. Any questions from anyone else around the table? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:19:42] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you John for the guidance. I'm hoping you can provide us some rationale for adding those days in the last part of your guidance with regard to Humbug to the Oregon-California border and adding in Chinook opportunity in these alternatives. What's the basis for that?

John North [00:20:16] Thank you Miss Yaremko. Yeah, like everybody else, first round of model outputs and a lot of moving parts, but essentially on this one very little modeled impact. We're trying to go through the modeling and optimize opportunity and access to other stocks with, you know, while minimizing our impact on some of the stocks of concern, and this one, I think if I recall, penciled out with very little impact so we were trying to get some, a little bit of opportunity down on the south coast there.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:51] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:20:58] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for your response. Just generally speaking, with regard to your commercial alternatives from Cape Falcon to the Oregon-California border. I'm looking at Alt 1 as well as Alt 2 and Alt 3. I'm looking at what is Page 5 currently in our packet before the guidance you've provided, and I note that your proposed Chinook fishing opportunities there are no quotas. Open seven days a week, all salmon except coho. I'm wondering if you've thought about applying quotas for these opportunities in light of discussions we had earlier in the week about very low harvestable surplus of both Sacramento and Klamath fish? Thank you.

John North [00:22:16] Thank you Miss Yaremko. Yeah, so on all those alternatives we do have a weekly landing limit which we've used in the past. We haven't typically used quotas because the fishery isn't generally that powerful. The weekly landing limits have functioned fairly well. And for instance, last year our catch of both the stocks was about half of, Sacramento and Klamath, was about half of what we anticipated in the model, so I think if anything it's been underperforming modeled. So our feeling was that there's, we don't need an overall quota on the season right now. Does that make sense? Does that answer your question?

Marci Yaremko [00:23:13] It's an answer. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:18] Any further question on the Oregon guidance? and not seeing any let's see if the Washington guidance has made it there, or excuse me California? And there it is.

Marci Yaremko [00:23:45] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So looking at Agenda Item E.4.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 8th, 2025, implement the following changes. Table 1, the California Commercial Management Alternatives that begin on Page 6. For the area from the Oregon-California border to the Humboldt South Jetty or the California KMZ: Alternative 2, replace the 1,000 Chinook quota with 550 Chinook. From 40°10' to Port Arena, the Fort Bragg area: Alternative 1, remove May 22 through 31 and replace with May 16 through 20, 23 through 27, May 30th through 31st. And alternative 2, replace the 4,000 Chinook quota with 2,100 Chinook. For Point Arena to Pigeon Point or the San Francisco Management Area: Alternative 1, remove May 16 through 31st and replace with May 16 through 20, 23 through 27, and 30 through 31. Alternative 2, replace the 4,000 Chinook quota with 4,200 Chinook. In the Fall Area Target Zone: Remove the September dates and replace with September 1st through 2nd, 5 through 9, 12 through 16, 19 through 23, and 26 through 30. In the Fall Area Target Zone, replace the 10 Chinook landing and possession limit with 30 Chinook. And then from Pigeon Point to the U.S.-Mexico border, the Monterey Area: Alternative 1, remove May 16 through 31st and replace with May 16 through 20, 23 through 27, and 30 through 31. Moving to Table 2. The California Recreational Management Alternatives that begin on Page 19. The California-Oregon border to latitude 40°10', or the California KMZ: Alternative 1, remove September 1st through October 15th. Alternative 2, add June 5th through 8. 40°10', oop, too far. Thank you. 40°10' to Point Arena, Fort Bragg area: Alternative 1, remove September 1st through October 15th. Alternative 2, add June 5th through 8. Point Arena to Pigeon Point or San Francisco Management Area: Alt 1, remove September 1st through October 15th. Replace with September 1st through 8th, 29th through 30, and October 5th, 1 through 5, and 27 through 31. for Alternative 2, add June 5 through 8 and replace August 28 through 31st with August 25th through 31st. For Monterey Area, Pigeon Point to U.S.-Mexico border: Alternative 1, remove September 1st through October 15th. Alternative 2, add June 5 through 8, replace August 28 through 31 with August 25th through 31st. And then moving to table 5. This is the line item that sets the Sacramento River recreational fishery share that begins on page

27. Alternative 2, remove the Sacramento River recreational fishery share of 15% of total harvestable surplus such that the river recreational share is estimated via status quo modeling methodology of 14.5% of the river run size.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:02] Thank you Marci. Again let me check-in with Dr. O'Farrell. Do you have any questions regarding this guidance?

Michael O'Farrell [00:28:12] No questions.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:15] All right, thank you. Let me look around the table and see if there are any other questions regarding that? I'm not seeing any, thank you very much Marci. David Sones, any tribal recommendations here?

David Sones [00:28:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. No, we have no further guidance at this time.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:38] All right, thank you. I'm going to look to Angela. I believe this wraps up what we need to do under this agenda item then.

Angela Forristall [00:28:46] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. This wraps up all of your tasks under Agenda Item E.4. And we will check-in on the status of salmon for the rest of the day.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:58] All right, thank you very much. So stay tuned this afternoon, see if we have a chance to come back for any updates. And with that, I'll close this agenda item and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

5. Further Direction for 2025 Management Alternatives

No transcription for this agenda item.

6. Further Direction for 2025 Management Alternatives

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes the reports. I do not see any public comment. That's been confirmed. So takes us into our Council action, clarification on any of the questions and any additional direction and management. So I'll look around and see who wants to start the discussion. North, south, east, west, John North.

John North [00:00:34] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, Oregon does have some guidance today, both recreational and commercial management alternatives. If we can get those on the screen I guess.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:52] It appears they haven't received them yet.

John North [00:00:58] Well I thought I sent it but I will double check that. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:10] Kyle Adicks are you ready?

Kyle Adicks [00:01:13] I do have some guidance as well. Maybe I could go while we get Oregon's.....

Pete Hassemer [00:01:18] Okay.

Kyle Adicks [00:01:24] So guidance relative to Agenda Item E.5.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 9th, 2025, implement the following changes. On Table 1, the WDFW Commercial Management Alternatives on Page 3, under Alternative 3: Adjust the landing and possession limits for Chinook for the July 1 through 9 period to 60 Chinook. Adjust the landing and possession limits for Chinook beginning July 10th to 50 Chinook. And then on Table 2, WDFW Recreational Management Alternatives on page 16 for the Westport Subarea and Alternative 1: Edit the third sentence of season rules to read, "beginning June 28th all salmon, two salmon per day, no more than one of which may be a Chinook". These are just some small tweaks to regulations. The commercial alternative to lower the landing and possession limits in the alternative with the smallest Chinook quota and then a change to the daily limit in the Westport Subarea to make it consistent with the Columbia River Subarea should not have any effect on the modeling. Since this might be our last check-in before final action I'll just highlight that there are two north of Falcon coho stocks that aren't meeting objectives in any of the three alternatives. These are still with last year's inside Puget Sound and inside coastal Washington marine and freshwater area fisheries. Hood Canal, we know we'll have some extensive changes within Puget Sound to address that one. There's a small portion of the impact in Council fisheries and we could close all those fisheries and still not meet the objectives there. And for Gray's Harbor, we also know there'll be changes to fisheries inside Gray's Harbor in freshwater areas that will have to happen through the north of Falcon process over the next month to meter our exploitation rate ceiling there. Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:17] Thank you Kyle. Let me first check with Dr. O'Farrell, see if that is clear to him for the STT analysis? Mike.

Michael O'Farrell [00:03:28] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes it is clear.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:31] All right, thank you. Any other questions regarding that around the table though of Washington guidance? And I'm not seeing any so thank you for that Kyle. Let's go to California. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:03:55] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. All right, guidance for California as shown in Agenda Item E.5.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 9th, 2025. Implement the following changes. Table 1: The Commercial Management Alternatives beginning on Page 6. For Alternative 1: From 40° 10' to Point Arena, this is the Fort Bragg Area: Replace the weekly landing and possession limit of 6 Chinook to 10 Chinook. Point Arena to Pigeon Point: Replace the weekly landing and possession limit of 6 Chinook to 10 Chinook. And Pigeon Point to U.S.-Mexico border, Monterey: Replace the weekly landing and possession limit of 6 Chinook to 10 Chinook. And Alternative 2: In the Fort Bragg Area: In the placeholder regulatory language, replace same as Alternative 1 with the language in Alternative 1, but replace "harvest limit" with "quota". In the San Francisco Area: In the placeholder regulatory language, replace same as Alternative 1 with the language in Alternative 1, but replace "harvest limit" with "quota". And then from the area from Point Reyes to Point San Pedro, this is a portion of the San Francisco Cell: Replace Point San Pedro with Point Sur. Following the September dates, September season dates, add, "or attainment of an 8,000 Chinook quota". And replace the 30 Chinook landing and possession limit with 15 Chinook. In the area from Pigeon Point to the US-Mexico border, that's the Monterey Cell: In the placeholder regulatory language replace same as Alternative 1 with the language in Alternative 1, but replace "harvest limit" with "quota". Moving to the Recreational Management Alternatives in Table 2. Alternative 1: Point Arena to Pigeon Point add a Point Reyes to Pigeon Point Subarea. Move the September and October dates under the Point Reyes to Pigeon Point Subarea. Replace 5,000 Chinook during September through October with 7,500 Chinook during September through October. Then Pigeon Point to the U.S.-Mexico border in Monterey: Add a Pigeon Point to Point Sur Subarea. Under the Pigeon Point to Point Sur Subarea: Add September 1 through 8 and 29 through 30. Add 7,500 Chinook during September through October. Then moving to Table 5. Adjust the Klamath River recreational fishery share such that the projected natural area adult spawner escapement equals 18,687. And I do have one addition to this guidance if perhaps we can get it on the screen. And that would be to incorporate the recommendations as provided in Supplemental EC Report 1, Agenda Item E.5.a, March 2025. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:09] Thank you Marci. Let me check with Dr. O'Farrell. Any questions on that?

Michael O'Farrell [00:08:16] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. None at this time. I think we can work within the STT to make sure we've got all this.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:25] All right, thank you. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:08:28] Yeah and I thought I might take a minute just to explain a little bit. These changes don't really make a lot of sense unless you've been having some of the discussions that have gone on in the back rooms and so I want to just elaborate a little bit that in an effort to provide some to.....we've thought long and hard about how to structure alternatives for fall fisheries and due to considerations for Klamath fall Chinook and a desire to avoid them, the options that are presented for September fisheries now are limited to the area from Point Reyes south to Point Sur. And that Point Sur line is actually in Monterey. And the reason we don't want to go to the US-Mexico border is due to the potential for winter run impacts in the month of September. So this is

going to require some reorganization of the description of the cells in both Table 1 and Table 2 so that we show this kind of limited area of fishing opportunity that's within both the San Francisco and Monterey cell. So just wanted to highlight that. We also wanted to, in this subarea, that the thinking is that we can design fishing opportunity that would hopefully access the abundant Mokelumne stocks more so than the Sacramento stocks so that we're focusing our fishing effort in the area where we expect the impacts on the stocks of concern to be lessened. I want to speak to the adjustment of the Klamath River recreational fishery share, that's something that is needed to ensure that per the harvest control rule that was adopted earlier this week for Klamath is done to maximize the harvestable surplus for the Klamath Trinity Tribes. So that allows their full access to their 50% share under the 50% sharing arrangement. So that's why we do that is roll all those fish in the river so that they can have full access to their 50%. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:20] Thank you. Any questions on that? Angela.

Angela Forristall [00:11:25] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted to provide some clarification on the last part of your guidance for Pigeon Point to the US-Mexico border. You added language, Chinook during September through October, but as the cell reads right now I do not see any open dates in October so I was just hoping for clarification on that language?

Marci Yaremko [00:11:53] Yes it's open in September only for the Monterey subarea. The winter run biological opinion dates require that.

Angela Forristall [00:12:23] Okay.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:23] Did that answer your question?

Angela Forristall [00:12:28] Sorry, I'm staring at your shadow behind you. I believe so. Thank you.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:33] Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:36] All right, thank you. And I'm sure if it's not clear to Dr. O'Farrell we will hear from him also. So thanks for the clarification. Other questions? Not seeing any I'll go back to Oregon. John.

John North [00:12:55] Yep, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, we'll try this again. Yeah, so today regarding Agenda Item E.5.a, Supplemental Report 1, dated March 9th 2025, we have some modifications beginning with the Commercial Management Alternative in Table 1, Page 4. There under Cape Falcon to Heceta Bank Line. Alternative 3: We would like to replace April 15th to June 30 with April 15th to May 31 and June 15th through 30. Under Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain: Under all three alternatives we'd like to replace, excuse me, language. We'd like to replace the language, "then all salmon except coho" with, "if the coho quota is met prior to September 30 then all salmon except coho season continues", consistent with past years. And on Table 2 under ODFW Recreational Management Alternatives beginning on page 18. For Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border under Alternative 1: For the marked selective coho fishery we'd like to replace the 50,000 marked coho quota with 44,000 marked coho quota. And under Alternative 2: For the marked selective coho fishery we'd like to replace 45,000 with 42,000 marked coho. And that is the extent of our guidance. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:31] Thank you John. Dr. O'Farrell is that all clear to you?

Michael O'Farrell [00:14:38] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. That is clear.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:42] All right, thank you. Look around and see if there...if anyone else has any questions regarding that guidance? I'm not seeing any. Thank you very much John. I'll look to David Sones, see if there's any tribal guidance here. David?

David Sones [00:14:59] The tribes are working on most all of the inside fisheries right now so they don't have any further guidance at this time.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:09] All right, thank you. I think that completes the guidance. And I'm going to turn to Angela to see if there's anything else we need here.

Angela Forristall [00:15:20] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, I think the STT has everything they need to move forward, so this completes your tasks for this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:30] All right, thank you. Appreciate the dedication of the STT to get this done for us. And I think stay tuned for the next salmon check-in, but we'll close out this agenda item.

7. Adopt 2025 Management Alternatives for Public Review

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes all our reports, the public testimony, will take us to Council action. And that has been refreshed on your screen up there. So I will look for anyone's hand, anyone who wants to initiate the discussion on this item. And at some point we do need a few motions but let's see if there's any discussion first. John North.

John North [00:00:29] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, Oregon does have some final guidance today both commercial and rec on our alternatives and unfortunately it's a bit long because we're trying to clean up some issues in the regulatory format language that's been brought to our attention so, and then we also have one recreational fishery modification so if we could get the guidance provided up I'll go through that.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:00] All right, let's see if we've got the Oregon guidance ready to go. Looks like it's on the screen. Go ahead John.

John North [00:01:07] All right, thank you Vice-Chair. I'll try and get through this, it's quite long. But agenda item....in regards to Oregon Salmon Management Guidance, Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental STT Report dated March 10th, 2025, we'd like to implement the following changes. So in Table 1 under ODFW Commercial Management Alternatives, Page 4 for Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border: Replace April 15th through May 31 with April 15th through May 15th. See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason actions. Dates may be subject to further inseason action. And then add a second line, "May 16th through May 31". And then in the last paragraph of that section we'd like to add, "all vessels fishing in the area must land their salmon in the state of Oregon". And for Cape Falcon to....

Pete Hassemer [00:02:04] John, can I interrupt for just one minute? I know all week we've done this as guidance, but for these to go out as public review they need to be done as a motion. I'm not going to ask you to start over to reread everything, but if it's possible to just at the beginning state this is your motion and we have that, and then I can follow along and we can just do it under that process. It doesn't change anything, but instead of guidance put it in as a motion.

John North [00:02:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So with a correction that we have a motion from Oregon today.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:56] Yes.

John North [00:02:56] I will commence from the top again. Okay. On Table 1 of Page 4, Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border for Alternative 2: Replace April 15th to May 31 with April 15th to May 15th. See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason action. States may be subject to further inseason action. Add a second line, "May 16th through 31". In the last paragraph add, "All vessels fishing in the area must land their salmon in the state of Oregon". In the next section, Cape Falcon to Heceta Bank Line, under Alternative 3: Replace April 15th through May 31 with April 15th through May 15th. See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason actions. The dates may be subject to further inseason action. Add a second line, "May 16th through 31". Under Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain, for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 please add: "Oregon state

regulations require all fishers landing coho salmon into Oregon from any fishery between Cape Falcon, Oregon and Humbug Mountain, Oregon to notify ODFW within one hour of delivery or prior to transport away from the port of landing by either calling the number noted or sending notification via email as noted. Notification shall include vessel name and number of salmon by species, port of landing and location of delivery and estimated time of delivery". And add that all at the end of the regulatory language. Under Alternative 1: Replace April 10th through May 31 with April 10th through May 15th. See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason actions. Dates may be subject to further inseason action. Add a second line, "May 16th through 31". In the last paragraph add, "All vessels fishing in the area must land their salmon in the state of Oregon". Moving to Humbug Mountain to Oregon-California border, under Alternative 1: Add, "Closed. In 2026, the season will open March 15th for all salmon except coho. Chinook minimum size limit of 28 inches total length. Gear restrictions same as in 2025. This opening could be modified following the Council review at its March 26' meeting". And under Alternative 3 add "See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason action. States may be subject to further inseason action". And then add that after the April 15th to 30 date. And on Table 2, Recreational Management Alternatives beginning on Page 17 for Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain, for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: Remove the paragraph that begins with, "In 2026 the season will open", and replace...and under Alternative 1: Replace March 15th through May 31 with March 15th through May 15th. See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason actions. States may be subject to further inseason action. And add a second line, "May 16th through 31", and remove the paragraph beginning with, "In 2026 the season will open. Under Alternative 2 add: "See 2024 management measures and 2025 inseason action. States may be subject further inseason action". And add that after the March 15th to April 30th date range. For the Cape Falcon to Oregon-California border, under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3: Add the language, "In 2026 the season will open March 15th for all salmon except coho, two salmon per day, Chinook minimum size limit of 24 inches total length and the same gear restriction as in 2025. This opening could be modified following the Council review at its March 2026 meeting". And for Humbug Mountain to Oregon-California border, under Alternative 1: Replace May 1 through June 4th with May 16th through June 4th. And under Alternative 2: Remove May 15th through June 4th. And then same as Alternate 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:26] All right, thank you John. Before I look for a second we always ask to make sure it's accurate and complete. I just want to see if anyone here, that could include Dr. O'Farrell, STT, or Angela, if there's anything wrong? I think in the matter of the sake of efficiency here that we make sure it's all right. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:07:56] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Let's see, just in the interest of making sure we have everything clean and orderly here, I'm hoping you can scroll to the top. So Mr. North the way I interpret this is that it is a motion you are making to have this text go out for public review, correct? And if so, I would suggest maybe tightening up the language at the beginning here to say something to that effect.

John North [00:08:34] Yeah, thank you. I was intending to provide guidance and then a subsequent motion that referenced the guidance on the floor today. So I had submitted it in two pieces of guidance and motion, but I can add a second motion now. Go ahead.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:02] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:09:03] Yeah, thank you. I think it might be helpful first just to understand your intent here. This would be part of the package that we would put out to the public between now and April for their consideration after which we'd come back in April and and make final decisions per usual. So if this is part of that public review package I think it's probably clean. It's just to make it as a motion that you intend for this language to be sent out for public review. And I see there's a certified parliamentarian sitting next to you also and maybe she can help us here.

Christa Svensson [00:09:41] Yeah, thank you. You know I think it could go either way, meaning guidance is guidance. We quite often put out a motion and provide guidance within it. We have had discussions in the Council process about whether or not we need to include the guidance within the motion. So I think because we have this here with a language for a motion, it may be easiest to just take the motion so that it is in alignment with other states and how we have typically done this process. The one piece that I would want to check with my colleague here from Oregon is if there is the need for the second motion that he's got, if there is additional information in that motion? Do we need two motions or do we just need to have a very simple motion here?

Pete Hassemer [00:10:43] Let's.....hang on a second. Let's take a five-minute break and come back here. Five minutes please.....(BREAK).....Make sure we have enough time to format everything so. We're finishing up the wording so John I will turn back to you. You went through a number of changes. We just wanted to make sure the language is right at top. So I want to give you a chance to read that in here.

John North [00:11:35] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And sorry about that. I got the guidance ahead of the motion. I just intended to just....we recompiled it here. So my Oregon motion is to move to Adopt for Public Review the Alternatives for Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Fisheries in the area from Cape Falcon south to the Oregon-California border as presented in Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10th, 2025 as amended with the following changes that I previously read into the record.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:12] All right, thank you. And as I followed through everything on the...what had appeared on the screen was accurate and complete. Is that right? And we did look for any clarifications. We didn't see any, but do you agree it's accurate and complete?

John North [00:12:31] Yes, I agree. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:33] All right, is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

John North [00:12:49] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Sorry, just a little discombobulated here but. Yeah, so...yeah the motion as far as that's concerned, you know we have a.....what we were trying to do here today with this motion is to adopt the ocean regulations salmon season alternatives for off the Oregon coast but also include some last minute guidance to improve clarity and for the presentation of fisheries that were adopted in 24' for the period of May 15th through, or March 15th through May 15th. And then also fixing the language for the similar fisheries in 2026. So that's what all that, all the amendments were the guidance. You know as far as the motion, you know we have a lot of work ahead of us in San Jose but this initial set of alternatives for Oregon provides a base for us to work from and while remaining within the conservation constraints and the recent distribution of the impacts it's been a challenging week I must say and I want to express

my gratitude for all the work of the SAS and the STT, Council members and staff, my fellow managers and colleagues at ODFW I thank you all. And I appreciate all the sincere testimony we had this week, including that offered by the tribes and the public. And they remind us how we all need to work together. Oregon does understand and grasp the significant conservation concerns related to the Sacramento and Klamath Chinook stocks. We're trying to do our part, but we're also trying to access the healthy stocks of coho and Chinook we have returning to our coast and that's what this package represents.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:59] Thank you John. First, I'll look around and see if there are any questions for clarification on the motion? I'm not seeing any questions for clarification. Discussion on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:15:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I will be voting no on this motion. CDFW would like to reiterate its position that given the extremely low forecasts for California target stocks, it is more than reasonable to consider as one end of the bookend a season closure alternative for ocean fisheries south of Cape Falcon. A No-Fishing Alternative should be acknowledged as a possible outcome of the 2025 fishery planning process and if adopted would maximize escapement in 2025 in a year where it is critical to do everything we can to ensure the forecasted escapements are realized. CDFW is disappointed that Oregon's alternatives don't offer consideration of this bookend for public review. As proposed, Oregon's south of Falcon pre-September commercial fisheries are scheduled to open in April with no safeguards, specifically no vessel-based trip limits and no quotas or harvest limits. If the fish are there catches could be high and there's a good likelihood there will be harvest of both Klamath and Sacramento fish. Tables A-2, A-3, and A-4 from our STT Report show projected impacts to Klamath adults, age four Klamath adults, and Sacramento adults respectively in numbers of fish by fishery and alternative. While these tables do show relatively low projected impacts in Oregon's proposed fisheries, CDFW cautions that these projections may be unrealistically low. The harvest models this year are showing low impacts all the way around likely in response to low abundance forecasts. The key issue here is that California is concerned about ensuring we attain and hopefully surpass the projected escapements this year. Looking at Klamath fall run, the stock is currently overfished. Spawner abundance has been on average 32% below the escapement goal of 40,700 associated with the FMP objective since 2016. A poor stock status, patterns of low escapement combined with higher than anticipated exploitation rates, a river system and habitat undergoing dramatic change in response to dam removal, and the extremely low 2025 forecast are a cause for significant concern. With only a little more than 2,000 fish for harvest across all sectors there's little room for error. Turning to Sacramento fall run, per NMFSs guidance, the status recently as an overfished stock in the recent past and the current status of the stock relative to the overfished threshold, the pattern of low recent year escapements combined with higher than anticipated exploitation rates and over-forecasting remain a cause for concern in 2025. Collectively, these circumstances again support the need for very conservative management in 2025 with the potential for very limited fishing. Sacramento fall Chinook contributes significantly to Oregon's fisheries. Over the last 12 years the average proportion of Sacramento fall Chinook harvest in Oregon's ocean fisheries is about 30%, ranging from about 20% to 60%. Management tools are available that would achieve this very conservative management guidance from NMFS that would go a long way to ensure harvests don't exceed the harvest projections in tables A-2, A-3, and A-4. Yet those management tools are lacking in the Oregon alternatives other than for fall fisheries. Opening fisheries with no limits in the 2025 season does not seem precautionary in light of this year's forecasts. The California fleet has been tied to the dock for two years now. California salmon stocks are not yet ready to support robust fisheries.

We are in a worse position now than we were two years ago regarding forecasts for our two target stocks. And in 2023, when Sacramento fall forecasts were similar to what we have this year, Oregon stood by California to close Chinook fisheries south of Cape Falcon. At that time we were in agreement that we should forgo the limited potential fishing opportunity due to the slim margin of error and risk to the stock. Now in 2025 we should at the very least consider the same no-fishing scenario this season since we find ourselves in the same, or in the case of Klamath fall run, an even worse scenario for California stocks. Mike Sorensen I want to thank you. I appreciate your testimony from you and the remarks offered by Butch as well. You mentioned the best available science and how important it is in forming the development of alternatives and the very real situation with public perception when we put alternatives out for consideration. We've been managing to the best available science, and despite use of our management tools we've been exceeding our management targets. For several years now we've been taking very conservative management measures and we're still in a tough spot with our salmon stocks. But just to be clear when it comes to California, it's not perception management that we're looking for in California. We are seriously considering closures as part of our range of alternatives. It may not seem that way as we've been spending a lot of time designing alternatives with a number of safeguards all week with the goal of providing a range of opportunity and a range of alternatives for public comment that include fishing opportunities and closure opportunities. So we expect to receive lots of comments and discussion about the possibility of closures as we leave this meeting. So with that, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:53] Thank you. Further discussion on the motion? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:21:57] Thank you Vice-Chair. And also, I just wanted to address the best available science comment. Keep in mind that our fishery management plan for Sacramento fall Chinook provides for an escapement range of 122,000 to 108,000 fish and typically our three options have exercised that range. And so to provide for no Chinook harvest does serve the purpose of showing a range of escapement consistent with a fishery management plan and it's not contrary to best available science.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:42] Thank you. Further discussion? John North.

John North [00:22:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Since I prepared it I think this at least will help explain Oregon's position. So the question of why no zero Chinook option has been a popular thing this week and I just wanted to share that the Oregon SAS members and I, along with other staff, we've met multiple times this week in lengthy discussions and probably more than any other meeting and the issue of the request for a no-fishing option south of Falcon, as brought up in the California letter, was discussed and debated and we worked hard to develop three different alternatives for consideration, but at the end of the day the Oregon SAS members just could not see the merit in developing a no-fishing option for Oregon waters because the question was raised, if the numbers indicate that there's some fish to harvest then why can't we follow the process and the science and design fisheries within that? And so, you know, I think all of the Oregon alternatives fit within the historic Oregon shares for the harvestable numbers, both Sac and Klamath, and they represent a range of options and including Alt 3, which has a modeled impact rate of .2% on the Klamath forecast and 1.7 on the Sacramento, so it's very, very limited. On the recreational side, the primary reasoning behind a no-fishing option is that we have around 75,000 coho available for harvest and fairly low impacts in general in the recreational fleet. But on the troll side it came down to survival really. You know fully acknowledging the dire situation in

California, the Oregon troll fishery is in serious jeopardy. Been in disaster relief for six of the last seven years. 2024 is pending but we won't probably even get that because we've filed more than five times in 10 years so we don't even qualify. We talked about fishers trying to survive another year without going under. We talked about how a limited fishery could make the difference between making a boat payment or paying other bills or not. And we talked about 10 trolling vessels being demolished and 35 more waiting to be crushed. So that's the situation, and in that context a no-fishing alternative for 2025 just wasn't a place we could go unfortunately so.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:50] Thank you John. Other discussion on the motion? I'm not seeing any hands I will call the question on the motion. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:26:05] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:07] Opposed?

Marci Yaremko [00:26:08] No.

Corey Ridings [00:26:08] No.

Rebecca Lent [00:26:09] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:14] Let me make sure I can tally those. Marci Yaremko, Corey Ridings. I believe I heard a third voice.

Rebecca Lent [00:26:33] Mr. Vice-Chair, that was Rebecca Lent voting no. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:39] Thank you. So we have the no votes. Abstentions?

Marc Gorelnik [00:26:43] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:52] The abstention was Marc Gorelnik, sorry. Thank you. With that, the vote passes with three no votes, one abstention. Thank you John. Any other motions? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion for California. I move to adopt for STT Coalition, Analysis, and Public Review the Salmon Management Measures for the 2025 Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Ocean Fisheries in the areas from the Oregon-California border to the U.S.-Mexico border as Presented in Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10th, 2025, including the commercial and recreational requirements, definitions, restrictions and exceptions.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:43] I followed along as you went through that, the language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Marci Yaremko [00:00:50] Yes I do.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:51] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:57] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just want to start by explaining that we've developed two alternatives that do include some small fisheries for California commercial and sport fisheries. I want to thank our SAS for working so hard to think about the needs of our communities and our constituencies up and down the California coast and worked very hard to provide some opportunity in all areas, albeit very modest. Our SAS remains very concerned about the state of California's salmon stocks. Many of those concerns have been articulated throughout the week. I want to thank the SAS for proposing a no fishing season in Alternative 3 with varying levels of fishing opportunity in Alternatives 1 and 2. We do believe we're showing a range of opportunity for consideration and public review and input. The SAS really did some creative thinking with regard to opportunities, particularly in fall fisheries, and providing some unique opportunity. Alternatives 1 in the sport fishery and Alternative 2 in the commercial fishery show fall fishing in the area between Point Reyes and Point Sur, which is not something we've ever contemplated before. This section of coast encompasses two subareas across the larger San Francisco and Monterey management areas. The intent of sticking to just this section of the coast is to limit impacts to Klamath fall Chinook in the north while accessing the currently more abundant Mokelumne stocks, which tend to congregate in the Pillar Point area. Thinking ahead, although today marks the end of the March Council meeting, there's more work to be done when we get back to finalizing one alternative in April. All three alternatives are currently under our SONCC management objective, but we know that additional forecasting data for British Columbia is expected in the coming weeks and this really could change the total ocean exploitation rate and push us over the combined 16% exploitation rate on the Trinity River naturals. So this was an issue that was out there last April so I'm just flagging that although we have two alternatives that meet the constraints right now, this is something new for us in California. Waiting for inputs until after April is not something that we've ever contemplated before. And so I would just caution that while Alternatives 1 and 2 do show fishing opportunity, we still have yet to receive some of the necessary inputs so that may prompt changes. Thinking about the commercial fisheries that are proposed, it would be the first time a fishery in California was managed under the constraints of the California Coastal BiOp and quotas or harvest limits and weekly vessel landing limits. If you look at the range of alternatives that are proposed, that weekly landing limit is very low, 10 fish per vessel per week in the pre-September fisheries and 15 fish per vessel per week in September, each with very restrictive harvest limits or quotas depending on the area that those fishery activities would occur. This is a substantial change and a significant impact to our fleets and our business as we learn to adapt to this new reality. Considering the alternatives and the ability to make money from these commercial fisheries, a good portion of the fleet probably may decide to stay tied up. It's not exactly a wage that's going to provide food for the dinner table, but there are those that will be happy to pursue small scale opportunities and appreciate those opportunities. And with two years of closures and this new management regime, the department and the commercial fleet sees huge value in the data collection aspect of these proposed fisheries. We kind of consider them, because of their small scale nature, something akin to a test fishery, hopefully to prove that we can work within the limits that have been developed and it will also provide an opportunity to gather data on vessel participation and how the fleet responds to this new set of constraints. And that will certainly assist us in developing management measures in the future years when we are looking at more robust stocks. The sport seasons. I Just want to also acknowledge the hard work of the SAS in planning time on the water very cautiously this year. Several small openers are spread out. They're three, four, five days in duration across the summer and fall months with caps on harvest in place that would prevent the fishery from exceeding the management targets. The time between these short openers will allow the department to review the data we receive from our monitoring

activities and estimate the harvest and then make decisions on the future days that are scheduled and whether or not we need to adjust those dates inseason so that we stay within those harvest guidelines. This allows us to stop and count and open or close as needed in response to what our harvest levels are. So again I just, I really want to thank our SAS for what seemed to be a very concerted effort to move forward in the face of change and the reality that we have to find a way to keep our fisheries going and it's going to take some time to rebuild. But overall I'm optimistic. I think there are a number of good signs that future forecasts and future abundance levels of our target stocks will once again be prolific. And I think these alternatives set us on the right path forward for considering how we would prosecute future salmon fisheries off California. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:45] Thank you Marci. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:08:58] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I agree with you Marci. You and your staff and your team and the SAS members have done an awesome job trying to craft what might be the first fishing season, however big or small, in this year. And I know it's difficult and how hard you've worked and the pain that California fishermen have suffered because of this and I'm hoping that we can get your fishermen back on the water however small this year, but hopefully then next year we'll be back to normal and that awesome California salmon machine will be fired up in both sport and troll and make Washington people jealous once again like we were. And I will be supporting your motion and recognizing the hard work that you have done and your team once again to get to this point, and hopefully when we come in April we can put some kind of season and not the other. But I support your range of options and thank you and appreciate all your hard work because I know what you've gone through to do this. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:13] Thank you. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:10:15] Thank you Vice-Chair. You know I've been doing this a long time now and it gets more difficult and more difficult. And the challenges we face in putting together a fishery has nothing to do with past exploitation by the fisheries. And we end up squabbling amongst ourselves, between sectors, between states, when the real problem, the real challenge we have is letting our salmon do what they want to naturally do. Very resilient species. Pretty much just add water. And the only promise we have in coming years is that precipitation perhaps has overwhelmed the exports and other uses of water that have damaged the fisheries. So you know these meetings, I mean I'd like to get back to meetings when we're all smiles and handshakes and everyone gets opportunity. It's been tough in California with two closed years and this year, even if we have a fishery, it's not really a fishery for the commercial. They can't make a living on 10 fish a week. It costs more to operate the boat. So obviously I'll support the motion, but I just want to remind everyone, although it's probably unnecessary, that our fisheries are the victim of decisions made by others. And it's been hard but we've got to make the best of what we've got and hope for a brighter future.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:00] Thank you Marc. Further discussion? Jennifer Quan.

Jennifer Quan [00:12:05] Yeah, just a comment and acknowledgement of appreciation for the hard work and collaboration. That's a big lift. Like, this is huge, acknowledging how novel this is for California, how progressive this is and acknowledging the risks that everyone's taking with

what's provided here and people's willingness to give it a shot. So thank you Marci. Thank you staff. Thanks to SAS folks and all the California constituencies that kind of helped move this forward this week. So just acknowledging that. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:49] Thank you. Any other discussion? Not seeing any I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:12:59] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:00] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Any other motions here? Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:13:18] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do have a motion. I move to Adopt for Public Review the Alternatives for Non-Indian Commercial and Recreational Fisheries in the area north of Cape Falcon as Presented in Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, dated March 10th, 2025, with the following modifications. For the north of Falcon non-Indian fishery, adjust the quota in Alternative 3 to 85,000 marked coho. Calculate all commercial, recreational, and subarea allocations consistent with the fishery management plan to find sharing throughout Tables 1 and 2.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:56] Thank you Kyle. The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Kyle Adicks [00:14:02] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:02] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion.

Kyle Adicks [00:14:08] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And as always thanks to the SAS and STT, they both had very long challenging weeks and appreciate their dedication to get us from the starting point back last Thursday, I guess, to some final alternatives today. As we've heard several times through the week, there's still a lot of moving pieces. In the next couple of weeks we'll start to get information on fisheries in Alaska and British Columbia that will have an effect on the modeling that's in front of us today. We're also just getting started on our planning for fisheries and inside waters in the Columbia River, coastal Washington, and Puget Sound. We know there'll be significant changes to those fisheries. One of the fun things we deal with in Washington is pink salmon in odd years, and we have some pretty large pink salmon returns headed to the Fraser River and Puget Sound. Those fisheries will have impacts on some of the stocks that we're looking at in Council waters as well. As we look at the modeling results today, there were two stocks that did not meet our conservation objectives in any of the alternatives. Hood Canal coho is one that we know will have some significant changes in Puget Sound. The ocean impact on that stock is pretty small and even if we closed the ocean fisheries we still wouldn't meet the objectives with the modeling we're looking at. And Grays Harbor coho were also bolded in all three alternatives as not meeting objectives. And again, we know that we'll have to make some changes with inside fisheries with any of these alternatives to meet our objectives. One other stock of note is interior Fraser coho, Thompson River it's often called, we have a Pacific Salmon Treaty obligation to limit our southern U.S. exploitation rate on that stock to 10%. And again, we're going to be having some pink fisheries this year that will impact that stock, so we'll have to plan carefully in connection

with Council fisheries to meet that objective. There was a small decrease in the coho quota in Alternative 3, and that was really just to give us a range that we felt confident would help us as we start to plan all those inside fisheries to make sure we have, meet our conservation objectives and have a balance of inside outside sharing in all of the stocks. I think that's all I'll say, but again thanks to everyone for a lot of work through a very long week.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:24] Thank you Kyle. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion then I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:16:42] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:46] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Kyle. David Sones.

David Sones [00:16:56] Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe I have a motion here. Thank you. Tribal motion. For Tribal Fisheries in the area north of Cape Falcon I move the Council Adopt for Public Review and Alternatives as Presented in Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental STT Report 1, Table 3, March 11, 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:25] Thank you. That language there appears accurate and complete. Is that right?

David Sones [00:17:30] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:30] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

David Sones [00:17:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I'd also like to thank and appreciate all the work going on in the back rooms. It's always really difficult with salmon. And then dealing with the modeling timeframes that we've been having to deal with in this meeting has been really tough. But also along the same lines as Washington has spoke, we do have a lot of stuff to work out on the inside between this meeting and April, so until we see some of that work our numbers will be remaining the same. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:19] Thank you. Any questions for clarification? No questions. Discussion on the motion? Seeing no questions I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:18:33] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:35] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you David. With that we'll get our task list up before us and I will check in with Angela to see what other items need to be done here. Angela.

Angela Forristall [00:19:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. The Council did provide some additional guidance for Washington and Oregon, which will be incorporated as we move forward with the development of Pre-2, which will be posted later. And you adopted proposed salmon fishery management alternatives for public review, so your work here is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:22] All right, thank you. I also want to express my gratitude on behalf of everybody up here. I know it was a long, a difficult, a hard week. People are remote. There were a lot of challenges to overcome and did a great job here and glad we were able to put this together. So with that, I think that completes this agenda item.

8. Appoint Salmon Hearings Officers

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, thank you Angela. Any questions on that? I'm not seeing any questions. As was noted, Attachment 1 is there with the hearing times, locations, dates, and the attendees. And just to confirm that everything is complete there. We don't need any motion on there. Maybe I will just follow through the list and look first to Washington.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:29] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I can confirm that I will attend the hearing. I'm happy to serve as the Hearing Officer. I believe Mr. Smith might be joining me in Westport that evening.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:41] All right, thank you. California.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:46] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I can confirm that Kandice Morgenstern will represent the STT at the hearing in Santa Rosa and that Marc Gorelnik will serve as the Council's Hearing Officer. And other Council members are likely to attend as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:04] Thank you. Oregon. John North.

John North [00:01:09] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, for that meeting on March 25th I will be a Council rep and Miss Cassie Leeman will represent STT as noted and yeah, all good.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:28] All right, thank you. Any other comments regarding that? Jennifer Quan.

Jennifer Quan [00:01:34] Yeah, Susan.....I think Susan, did you want to address this? Susan, are you there? Okay. I think in short, we will not have representation. That's what I've been told to say. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:07] All right, I saw a note flash up there also, Susan is having trouble with her audio. But just confirmation it was listed to be determined on there and NMFS will not be able to provide individuals to participate there. All right, thanks. Anything else need to be said with regard to the hearings? Angela, do we have everything we need on that agenda item?

Angela Forristall [00:02:42] Thank you. Yes, the states have all confirmed their representation at the hearings, and so I look forward to seeing you all there.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:50] All right, thank you. That completes that work so I will close out that agenda item.

F. Ecosystem Management

1. 2024-25 California Current Ecosystem Status Report and 2025 Science Review Topics

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right. I think that we don't have any public comment just to make sure. Check with the tower in the back of the room. Got the goose egg. All right, with that I'll open the floor for discussion as needed, appropriate. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:19] Thank you Chair Pettinger. It wasn't spoken to, but I did want to point out that there's a written public comment provided by Michele Conrad on behalf of the Ocean Conservancy. I found that really helpful, and I know a lot of other folks did to have the high-level synthesis of the report. It was a sort of one page place where I could send people who didn't have time to read the entire document. So just wanted to thank Miss Conrad and the group that organized that. I found it to be really helpful as did many others.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:52] Thank you Lynn. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:53] Thank you Chair. I was going to mention that one pager, which I called an appetizer, and it just enticed me into reading the report, so thank you Michele for that. And I do appreciate, again, the fact that humans are included in the ecosystem report, including the collection of what we see on the water. We sure heard a lot about that over the past couple days. And I just want to bang that familiar old drum of gross revenues as opposed to net revenues. The report has a lot of really good information about economics, a lot of information on gross revenues, but it doesn't tell us what the net revenue is, how much the fishermen actually take home once they've paid all their costs. And the good news is, thanks in part to the Cost Recovery Program, we do have these data through FISHEyE, where we've collected cost data with the cooperation of our groundfish fishery, and you can go to FISHEyE and find out how much money people took home. Is it...do the decline in landings, are they made up for by increases in prices? What's the driver behind fluctuations in gross revenues? That's extremely important so we know what's going on at home in these communities that we care for. So let's make the most of what our groundfish fishery participants are already paying for and get that out there. Let's see if we can't get that incorporated into next year's report. Thank you Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:27] Thank you Rebecca. All right. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:35] Thank you Mr. Chair. Late in the day. I'm going to put you way into the future here on this one. Something's been sticking in my mind since the last agenda item. It was the eDNA and the ecosystem advisory cracked the door open a little bit because they mentioned it in their report. I'm just thinking about linking what's going on in the Science Center and how this information in the ecosystem report can be used. So what was on my mind, it was wandering here, is the Integrated West Coast Pelagic Survey is doing this trawl survey from the U.S.-Mexico border to Dixon Entrance, a lot of transects, a lot of different depths. Think of the map that they can create with the eDNA data about where whiting are, where whiting aren't, or any other species and associated oceanographic information. The Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel talked about regional forage ability. What came to mind is, in my experience in fisheries, a lot of surface-oriented species people hire spotter planes in herring fisheries, in the CPS or CPS fisheries, salmon,

purse seine fisheries, and that to go out and figure out where the fish are and direct the boats to them. I see this future where people have sail drones or ROVs collecting water samples to sample and figure out where they are. Getting a little out there but it is the 21st century and we've seen a lot of advances in technology come about very quickly. So maybe the only thing I would do, I should've mentioned it under the last agenda item, but sometime in the future getting a presentation from the Science Center. A little more detail on eDNA and what kind of information we're getting? Sort of how soon some of this will be developed, put into use? Besides this sort of strange searching for fish thing, also I'm thinking in the context of the ecosystem report bycatch avoidance. You start to see patterns, mapping patterns of fish distribution with oceanographic conditions that they can start to look at, and I don't know how good the predictive model is, but some of those things we're trying to do to either, you know, reduce bycatch or be able to target species, there's a lot to explore there. So at this time the ask is just within the next year, one of our next five meetings, if the Science Center has time to give us a little more information on that and we can think about how it could be incorporated into this ecosystem type approach we have. So thanks for indulging me on that strange thought pattern.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:45] All right, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. All right, anybody else? Okay, well I don't see any hands. Oh, Corey Ridings. You bailed me out.

Corey Ridings [00:05:58] Thanks Chair. I guess if it's appropriate, I was just going to suggest with some guidance that we endorse the reports that were provided to us today and the recommendations of the SSC in terms of the science review topics for 2025.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:22] Okay. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:06:24] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and thank you Miss Ridings. That's the conversation I was wanting to start having, was what do we want to do with the science review topics and how do we want to handle them? I think a lot of what's running through my mind is I'm not questioning the value of this information, but it's how do we respond to it and how do we provide the appropriate input back to the team. And so right now, you know this Council is used to taking a step back, spinning up committees that then meet, have several meetings, provide reports, those reports in this case would go back to the appropriate body, the appropriate team. I'm wondering if we can think about shortchanging that a bit, not shortchanging, but taking a shorter path to provide that information back to the folks that draft this report. And we've seen some great recommendations here that have come through several advisory bodies and Miss Ridings, you just indicated that you would like to endorse the recommendations of the SSC. Given that we have a very large workload with groundfish stock assessments, a lot of the same folks that are on the Ecosystem Subcommittee are also doing those stock assessments. We're short-staffed on the Council staff side at the moment. I don't know when we will fix that. I would propose we gather up these comments and send a letter to the team saying we endorse the following recommendations as you consider the next round of your report for next year. That opposed to, you know, putting together another review meeting over the summer on top of everything else that's happening So I wanted to float that out there to see what the thoughts were. Of course I work for you all, so you can tell me what your priorities are, but I do see a need to be very deliberate about our workload here and I think there's an alternative pathway that would work and also be responsive to our workload concerns.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:34] Okay. Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:08:39] Thanks Director Burden. Just a clarifying question on that. So you're suggesting that the, I think it was like a half-day webinar that they were suggesting to review the topics that typically happens in the fall? Is that the one you're talking about that you want not to do or you just want to?..... I'll let you talk. I'm just asking for a little bit more clarity? Thanks.

Merrick Burden [00:09:06] Yeah, thank you. I admit I've not participated in one of these meetings before, so if it's a half-day in the fall that's probably the one. I'm not sure if this is where you're going with your question, but to get one of those meetings together it takes some effort to put any meeting together on our side as staff. And then of course there's the focused work that an assessment author needs to do, and pulling them off of that for another thing just detracts from that work effort. So I just want to be cognizant of everything that we have going on and think about our priorities. And in terms of those priorities, if this is still a priority, which I understand there's a lot of interest in that around this Council, I'd like us to consider an alternative way to get the message across.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:05] Okay, thank you Merrick. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:10:06] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And as I understand it, what you're proposing then is in the immediate term following this meeting, just collate the reports which all had suggestions about topics for 2025, and then of course don't shortchange me, you'd add the recommendation I made and any others that we get from the Council. And then those would be sent and perhaps at a later date consider whether or not this formal half-day seminar is necessary. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:34] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:10:39] Thank you. Yes Miss Lent, that's what I'm suggesting. I would picture a cover letter to that. So for example, Miss Ridings highlighted the SSC recommendations as something that she was proposing and so that would be contained within that report as well as the advisory body reports that have supported that. And then what I would....if that's the direction that you would be okay with, I would proceed with staff and not plan on a fall meeting.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:11] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:11:16] Thanks Chair. Thanks for this discussion. Just as like clarifying for this conversation, even in my own head, the meeting that typically happens in the fall is actually a NMFS meeting of the IEA folks and the Ecosystem Subcommittee of the SSC. And essentially it gives the opportunity for the SSC to sort of deem these new methodologies as BSIA and for inclusion in the ESR the coming year and then for any other ways that that might be helpful, whether that be stock assessment or any other science that they're doing. Those methods are then deemed by this Council for use in management. So I guess what I'm getting at here is I'm not entirely sure if the Council sort of, as you said, doesn't sort of host this meeting. That essentially they'll go ahead with these methods anyway if we're saying we like them. They just wouldn't have the benefit of also having the SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee there, able to make that review and that determination for later use of that science in Council decision-making. And I'm kind of looking at Ryan, or maybe even the phone, to confirm that I fully understand that. But just wanted to put that out there in terms of what's efficient, and then also if there's going to be science that might be

really helpful to this Council in multiple ways to make sure that it's going through the review process so we can use it.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:59] Okay, I'm not sure who to look at here next for that. Ryan or, you thinking about that or? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:13:08] Thank you. If I think I got your question correct, to clarify that in the past two years the half-day meeting has been held remotely following the September Council meeting.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:25] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:27] Yeah thank you, and appreciate the thought Miss Ridings. So that is a question that I have, and maybe we have a difference of opinion about, and I would be very curious to hear some reflection on the point you made, which is using this information in management. I have a question about how we use this in management. It's certainly very interesting information and we are, I think, making headway as we learn more about this as we try to incorporate this information into risk tables, and that is one way that we would use it in management. I personally haven't thought of the report as something that we use in management. It's important contextual information. So a BSIA determination is something that we would use to say here's this information. Is it the best science for decision-making? If you are indeed using this information to make decisions, that's something I would very much benefit from understanding better than I do now. I have not asked the SSC to make a BSIA determination on these reports, so if that's something that you're looking for I would like to understand that as well.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:47] Heather Hall

Heather Hall [00:15:01] Well, I'll just confess I'm getting a little bit wrapped around the axle here and I feel like there's, I don't know if what you're suggesting is rather than....is providing some guidance in a letter. Some of the stuff that was talked about around the table, which seems efficient, but I think there's also a regular review that Ryan was mentioning that typically happens that the SSC mentioned in their report. So I think there's two different things, but I'm not sure.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:43] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:15:46] Yeah, thank you. There are two different things. I'm inviting a discussion about trying to be cognizant of our workload and basically say we have, you know, some great scientific institutions that are doing this work. How involved do we need to be in that work? And so what I've suggested is instead of having Council resources and capacity used to help iterate with that work, that we trust our scientific partners to do it and we still hear about it at this time of the year, we consider it and provide feedback in the form of a letter rather than having us be involved in that scientific product. So that's a partial answer to your question. I'm pausing now after the exchange that Miss Ridings and I just had because we have very different impressions of what this is for I think. So I don't know how to move forward if we don't have the same understanding of what the work product is for.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:56] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:17:01] Okay I'll take another go here. Appreciate the clarification. Thanks Heather for asking that question, that helped me too. It has been kind of the tradition in terms of the ESR that there's our science topics that are brought, I think it's usually every fall, maybe it was every other fall for a while, and the concepts around it, at least that I understood, was the IEA folks who make the ESR want everything in there to be as useful as possible for this Council and the folks who come to these meetings. And so the design of that product has specifically evolved over the years and they've done, in my opinion, a really good job of being responsive to everything they've gotten from the Council and the advisory bodies over the years to make that report as good as it can be for use by this Council. And part of that has been when they take on a new big topic or the Council says to them, hey, we're interested in this thing, you know whether it came up on the floor, it came from an advisory body, that they say, okay, well we want to develop our methodology around that with your SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee to make sure that it's passing scientific muster and that it's doing what is going to be useful within the Council and for the Council. So that has been at least the tradition for I guess the last 10-ish years since we started getting an ESR. So Merrick I'm very sympathetic to the....we do have to think about always prioritization and completely agree with you. I have utmost trust in our NMFS partners and scientists. I think the goal has been how can they do the best job to serve us. And then on top of that, when that new information comes in, can we trust it? You know has it passed scientific muster so we can look at that report and say, yeah, I'm confident making an important decision based on this information. So that's going to be my history.

Heather Hall [00:19:26] Well, thank you for that. That was really helpful to me, a reminder of how this works and that it's really the IEA team that's saying we really need the SSC's review and input on how we're planning to incorporate this new information into the report. And it's way better to do it before they put all their time and energy into it and and we say, well, did you think about this? So okay I really appreciate that, thanks. It seems like a valuable use of time.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:10] I got to may go ask the question, when you talk about BSIA, when you talk about the report that we just saw today, or the presentation, you wanted that deemed BSIA, or the....I'm just kind of. Just kind of connect those dots if you could for me?

Corey Ridings [00:20:32] Thanks Chair. Absolutely I'll give it a stab. I'll also note that I think, yes, he's still sitting there behind me. If we want to bring up Dr. Moore at any point, maybe we could do that because I suspect he's more of an expert than me. In terms of the BSIA determination, the specific components that are brought for review, so for example, the glider data that's being discussed now that would be....the SSC is recommending is part of that meeting in the fall, the IEA program can come present those materials to the SSC Subcommittee and the SSC Subcommittee can deem that as BSIA and they say that it is scientifically relevant and important to be used by the Council for decision-making. May I call Dr. Moore back up here?

Brad Pettinger [00:21:25] Sure.

Corey Ridings [00:21:26] Yeah, he's participated in more of those meetings than I have so I'm going to defer to his knowledge on this.

Tommy Moore [00:21:38] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I think Corey's summary's accurate. BSIA may not be the best term because that does have certain like MSA implications. So it's, you know, I guess like suitable for use in management or decision-making. In terms of how this information

is used, there's been a lot of discussion of PDO on the floor over the last couple of days. That is a product that's in the ESR, the stoplight charts, and refinements to those are also, they may not be writing policy around it, but they do influence how decisions are made. And so the overall goal is to review the new data products that are being developed, get a fresh set of eyes and folks who are deeply involved in the fisheries process and the Council process to have a look at them and provide more feedback input. From this last year's report, or from the November 5th SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee meeting, that's when we reviewed the krill and crab megalopy items and the Ecosystem Subcommittee provided feedback to the technical folks on what was there and so they can take that. And then the SSC at this meeting reviewed the Subcommittee's Report and suggested a few minor changes and then endorsed it for you, or you know, yeah supported the report. Hopefully that made some sense.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:10] Okay, I guess when I hear BSIA I get a little bit edgy if I'm not fully understanding where we're going because it's just a.... So again, what did we do last year at this stage? We got the report. Is what Corey's asking anything different than what happened last year? And I don't remember endorsing this to move forward in a process as she is, because if I guess if the Council did not do anything what would happen?

Tommy Moore [00:23:45] Well the SSC does work at the discretion of the Council and so if I remember from last year correctly, this is a....the review topics are a standard part that comes with the ESR report and then the SSCs Subcommittee has a, in the SSC's workload planning, does have a meeting penciled in for this. And so it's typically the Council, you know, just approves the recommendations and then the subcommittee proceeds with helping with the planning of the meeting. I may not have that quite right. I relied quite heavily on Kristin Marshall in the past because she was very good at that.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:28] Okay. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:24:33] Thank you, and thank you for the help. My understanding is this isn't asking for anything that we haven't been doing every year at this time. The thing that's a little bit different is taking a different approach and not having this review. That would be the thing that's being proposed that's different. And maybe this is a discussion for workload planning? I don't know, our future meeting planning? But I was just understanding this to be the process we normally go through to incorporate new information into the ecosystem reports and give the IEA team a chance to engage with the SSC Ecosystem Subcommittee.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:18] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:25:25] Yeah, thank you. And I appreciate this discussion. I apologize that I've made it a difficult one. My concern is still about just workload. So we started the meeting saying you know.... I'll put it this way, I've talked to current and former SSC members who have just been like this is too much, like we can't keep this up. And we have three vacancies on the SSC, I think that's partly the reason. We also have just a reduced capacity across our entire Council system at the moment because of turnover and newness and less financial capacity to bring in contractors and all sorts of things. And so what I'm trying to do in some ways is to treat this meeting as the review. Like we got this great report, our advisory bodies provided us some feedback and we can say, is this helpful for the next iteration? Or do we have to have a SSC Subcommittee meeting while we're going through the stock assessment process using many of the same people

who were involved in that process in this reduced environment and try to force all that together again? And I'm wondering if that's really what we want to do. We'll try it if that's what you want to do.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:40] Heather.

Heather Hall [00:26:47] Thank you. Thank you Chair, excuse me. I don't think this is trying anything new. It's just doing what we're doing. And the SSC Report did say they were interested in doing this and having the opportunity to do it. I didn't hear them saying we're struggling to not be able to accommodate doing what we've been doing. And I say this all with respect for where you're trying to come from as doing things different and recognizing workload, but I don't know that there's a big Council staff workload on that and I could be very wrong. But yeah, that's just the way I'm thinking through it and it could be too simplistically.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:33] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:27:40] Thank you Chair. And just to try to tease this out a little bit more with you and what you're saying Heather. And I think what I'm hearing from you Merrick, is that it's not necessarily the Council staff workload too, it's also the SSC workload and like their prioritization and ability to pull in other items at this moment. If they've already reviewed this now, like yeah, does that have to happen twice and could it free up the SSC to focus on other priorities as well that are important for other parts of our process. I think it's sort of a balancing across things, if I'm hearing that correctly, and I welcome anybody to correct me if I am not understanding that.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:20] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:28:26] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Szumylo. Just to add to that a little bit, maybe answer your question. In what we're looking at now the SSC has said, okay, we talked about last year's, we endorse them. We think they're good, they're technically sound, they should be included in the report next year, they can be used. And when they're looking at potential topics for this year, they're saying, okay, move this glider one forward. Don't do that second one because we shouldn't be doing that, that's somewhere else, and we have this other idea for a second one. And we will technically review them in September as we do every year with this process or almost every year with this process So they're interested and they're making a recommendation to the Council that, hey, these are topics we think you might think are interesting and worth it, and if you think so then in the fall we'll technically come together for half a day to review them and then come back the following March and say either yay or nay, these passed technical muster or they didn't.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:37] Okay. Well what's the will of the Council? Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:29:47] Yeah, thank you. I appreciated this discussion and I've learned something by it. I would say I think, what I would like to.....I don't want us to not move forward here, right? And so your task is to consider the report and then consider the review topics for 25'. And so I would still think it would be important to identify what those topics are. We have another time and chance to take up workload management if we do convince ourself that there's probably a different way we want to take this on or not, and that would be under, you know, workload

planning, so that would be another time to talk about the body of our work and how to accomplish it. So I would suggest that you still take up Part 2 here. What are the topics that are important to you? And one way or another we will figure out how to get that done.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:46] Okay. All right. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:31:02] Well, yeah I'm good with endorsing the recommendations in the SSC Report and their recommendations for the things moving forward. Did I mishear you? I think that's a good way to move forward and maybe I'll let Miss Mattes speak up.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:21] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:31:24] Thank you Vice-Chair. Miss Hall was just slightly quicker on the raise hand than I was. I thought we'd already done that when we talked about moving forward with what the SSC had recommended in their report. With considering it, if they're the ones who are recommending we consider and move forward I think we should. So agreeing with Miss Hall on what I think I heard you asking.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:03] Okay. What else? Anything else? Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:11] Apologize, maybe I'm going to mess this up here, but the SSC recommendations, I'm reading what they have, they're supportive of that. I'm thinking about their first recommendation, but, well in their words it's supportive of reviewing the first topic provided that the CCIEA Team provides concrete examples of new data types. I guess I haven't heard when they would get that. Maybe that's part of the process if we focus in on that part. Their other one was absent those concrete examples then a workshop. You know thinking about workload and timing and all of that, right now I'm less supportive of the workshop approach but having them look at something specific. So yeah, I support the SSC, us moving forward with that, but maybe a little more definition to what exactly they do or is that we need to think about that and come back under workload and be more specific about it?

Brad Pettinger [00:33:27] Thanks Pete. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:33:31] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thanks to a little birdie I've been reminded of section 2 .1 in the FEP that says each year at the SSC September meeting the SSC will review the selected proposed research during the September meeting with participation with the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel and Ad Hoc Ecosystem Work Group as are appropriate. So that's already built into the FEP to have the review in September. It's....I know the FEP isn't exactly a TOR but it is built into the language of the FEP.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:13] Okay. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:34:23] Thank you Chair. Thank you Miss Mattes. I think that's explaining what I think Miss Ridings was getting to when she said that this is something we've been doing for 10 years. And I think what the FEP description does is lay out the process for it and we've just been following that process and for the reasons that the SSC has asked for so.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:59] Gilly, I'll turn to you.

Gilly Lyons [00:35:04] Excellent. Thank you Mr. Chair. I believe you've....were you looking for sort of a check-in on where you are?

Brad Pettinger [00:35:14] Yep.

Gilly Lyons [00:35:14] Excellent. Sorry.

Brad Pettinger [00:35:20] I don't know, I went to Gilly. Corey, what do you got?

Corey Ridings [00:35:28] Thanks Chair. I was going to one just note, I don't know, Mr. Hassemer had my brain cranking there for a little bit so I was going to respond to that and hopefully be of some assistance to Miss Lyons in wrapping this up, which was just to say that I think Mr. Hassemer to your concerns I think that that is the sort of thing that might have to be decided sort of down the road or over the summer when that became available. And my interpretation of reading the report is we would be leaning on the expertise of the IEA and NMFS folks to decide how to do that at that point, whenever that was. I also just wanted to note, you know, in addition to sort of these topics being generally good, also noting that we had a couple other advisory bodies provide us with reports that were useful. I don't think there's any action items in those other three reports, but just to note that so the IEA folks moving forward can hear it clearly, that at least I agree with what they talked about and thought they provided some useful suggestions for next year's report. So just making it really clear that the folks that develop next year's ESR can and should use those recommendations from our advisory bodies. And then in terms of next steps here, you know, moving forward with the SSC's sort of topic recommendations and to Director Burden's concerns about workload, Miss Hall definitely triggered my memory, and to be honest I haven't really thought about work planning quite yet in this meeting, but the SSC always does a really nice job of providing us a very detailed table of what they're upcoming meetings, workshops, plans, webinars, et cetera, et cetera. I haven't looked at the one for this meeting yet but I'm assuming there's probably one in there maybe already. And so thinking about prioritization or coming back to this in work planning, we could bring that again up at the end of the meeting and get some more information from the SSC at that point about how this fits into their other priorities and maybe even in the meantime, before the end of the week, I for one have some questions about, you know the important thing to me that I've been thinking about this process is really getting the Council's input into the topics that go into this report. And so if the IEA Program is going to go ahead and work on this regardless, that's one thing, but for me making sure that the Council's input is part of that annual process remains important. So I may call a couple, phone a couple IEA friends over the week just to get a deeper understanding myself of the necessity of that. So in line with what Director Burden says his goals are about making sure we're prioritizing and being thoughtful about how we're spending time. I hope that was helpful, welcome input.

Brad Pettinger [00:38:37] Okay, thanks Corey. Gilly.

Gilly Lyons [00:38:43] Thanks very much Mr. Chair. And I believe that you have completed your action for this agenda item. You've had a great discussion about the ecosystem status report and a robust discussion about the science review topics for 2025. And if I understand the situation correctly, there I think is general agreement to endorse the SSC's recommendations as they are written in their report and then perhaps revisit the conversation about the exact game plan going forward during workload planning discussion on day last.

Brad Pettinger [00:39:28] Very good. So we're putting a fork in this baby, we're done, right?

Gilly Lyons [00:39:29] I believe so. Thanks very much.

Brad Pettinger [00:39:31] Okay.

G. Habitat Issues

1. Current Habitat Issues

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That concludes the public comment. I'll open the floor for discussion. There's no motions here but any thoughts? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:00:13] I want to thank the Habitat Committee for the report, but my question relates to a previous Habitat Committee recommendation. Back in November, about three months ago, we transmitted a letter to the Bureau of Reclamation, I believe, about Central Valley operations. We also had a spirited discussion, I recall, at the November meeting about the obligation of federal agencies to respond to letters from the Council. And I've not seen anything in the briefing book so I thought I'd take this opportunity to ask the Executive Director if we've received any response to that correspondence?

Brad Pettinger [00:01:03] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:01:03] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Appreciate the question Mr. Gorelnik. I don't believe we have. I guess I'll look to Kerry Griffin to see if he has a different response. Yeah, so confirm there's been no response to that letter.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:26] Okay. Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:01:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just one comment on the quaggas in Idaho. I don't know how much information has been relayed here, but the two treatments were lethal to the entire Snake River. Fortunately that's an upstream stretch below an irrigation diversion where flows are very low. And almost all of the fishery in there are hatchery supported, including the white sturgeon, so they are replaceable. The likelihood that treatments could occur further downstream is, in my estimation, extremely low because recharge to that section from the Snake River aquifer through all of the hatcheries that are there and back end recharging makes the volume incomprehensible to deal with, as well as the adjacent waterways that are in there. So hopefully this second treatment got it. It's higher up in the system than it was before. But we'll just have to hope that they don't detect anything after the second shot, because they went up a little higher above the highest Idaho power facility where they think it may have gotten a toehold and getting into those side ponds. We'll just have to see, but I certainly have concerns myself with the desires to try to eradicate and the impacts then that can occur. Either way, whether they get there or not if we have to treat to kill them and the likelihood it can be.....if we weren't successful in this smaller stretch I'm not sure you can be successful in any further distribution downstream. So let's hope we got it but just an awareness aspect relative to that.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:25] Thank you for that update Virgil. Okay, very good. Anyone else? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:03:34] Good morning. Thank you Chair. I just wanted to....well I appreciate what Mr. Moore just said about the quagga mussel. I was at the Pacific State's Marine Fisheries Commission Annual Meeting and saw the presentation on the first application and it is amazing what was done and what had to be done. So just appreciating your comments on that. I do want to

speak in support of the Habitat Committees recommendation to do a Quick Response Letter relative to the CRSO EIS. I think they did an excellent job providing comments on the EIS back in 2020 and appreciate that they're looking for an opportunity to have some coordination with managers and tribes before doing that and that leads to the need for a QR Letter, but just wanted to offer support for that recommendation.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:33] Thank you Heather. Guess I'll look around and see, oh, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:04:37] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Hall for that. I would absolutely support that and also just ask that the Habitat Committee take into account the public comment we heard today, especially regarding the importance of understanding the economic impacts on our fish.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:53] Thank you Corey. As far as the letter goes, we'll see if everybody agrees with that? Okay. All right, anything else? Kerry, how are we doing here?

Kerry Griffin [00:05:07] I think we're doing well. There was a good discussion and you've given a nod for the Habitat Committee to develop a Quick Response Letter in response to the Columbia River System Operation Notice. And I think that's your action from today and there's no further discussion. I think that concludes this agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:27] All right, thank you Kerry. Good work by golly.

H. Groundfish Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Okay, if he's not there then that'll take us to our charge which is to discuss and comment as appropriate so I'll open the floor for that. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:00:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think I'd just like to throw one comment out for some discussion, perhaps, relative to the comments we just heard from Craig about all things stock assessment being TBD in terms of travel and budget and staffing, which are all challenging and difficult scenarios to battle. I'm looking at data deadlines. The last ones are at the end of April and some in June, but those are for updates. The full assessments are in April after the April Council meeting. We don't have groundfish on the April calendar at all. I'm just looking for a nexus where we could get an update next or if June is the next one, in which case we're already missing perhaps a STAR Panel. Lots of timing nuance there. I'm just kind of connecting some pieces and wondering when we might reasonably be able to ask Craig for an update and know where we're at with assessments and what decisions this Council might need to weigh-in on relative to how they might proceed or not?

Brad Pettinger [00:01:28] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:01:31] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and appreciate the question, Miss McKnight. As you started with your comments, we've been trying to hold April as a no-groundfish meeting. I think the most important part of that was the desire to alleviate the workload on our groundfish staff. And so there is an opening there, which is at your discretion as the Council, to tell me how and what you want on your agenda, but I do think we should hold the idea that we have a very hard working groundfish staff and if we have them working March and April they actually don't get any work done because we go from one meeting to the next preparing briefing materials and not doing any work, although some people work 80 hours a week so there is some work that's done. But if an update in April is your desire, you know we'd be happy to talk with the Science Center about whether and the degree to which they could do that. I would just encourage you to continue holding the GMT in mind, right, as we go from March to April. If we do want to put something groundfish-wise on April, that would be their workload.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:41] Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:02:46] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Mr. Burden. I think my intent here is simply for a Science Center update. No attributed work to the GMT or comment or discussion needed by them necessarily. Just an update on where stock assessments are relative to moving our calendar or YAG on for June and beyond for our upcoming next biennium cycle process. So no work for the GMT is what I was envisioning, just an update on assessment progress.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:15] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:03:21] Thank you Chair. Yeah, I've confirmed with the Science Center if it addresses Miss McKnight's request that they can provide an informational report to the April meeting that would have an update if that would be okay?

Brad Pettinger [00:03:43] Thank you Ryan. Okay, we're good? All right, anybody else? I don't see any hands so I'll turn to Todd. Todd, how we doing?

Todd Phillips [00:03:55] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. You have addressed, you have considered and discussed the NMFS updates and the Northwest Fisheries Science updates as well. You had a little bit of discussion about the stock assessment process and it sounds like the Center will provide an informational report in, or for April regarding the questions that Miss McKnight brought up. I would say you have achieved your goals here and this agenda item could be concluded.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:22] All right, thank you Todd. And with that, that closes this agenda item.

2. Humpback Whale and Leatherback Sea Turtle Biological Opinion

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes care of our public comment and then Council discussion as needed, appropriate. So, Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:10] Thank you Chair. And I hope I'm not out of order. I just wonder if we could get an update on that TRT. We're all thinking about it and we're all wondering when it's going to happen and dates, et cetera. Thank you Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:24] All right. Thank you Rebecca. I'm not sure when we may get that but to be....is Keeley. Keeley, are you there? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:35] I am. Hi everybody. The Take Reduction Team appointments, they come from the NMFS Assistant Administrator. They'll come when the agency is ready to proceed. I know that's not what you wanted to hear right now but at this time the timetable is uncertain. And I'll just note too that although the pre-Take Reduction Team meeting scheduled for the week of March 30th has been postponed, we are still holding the subsequent dates previously identified for planning purposes.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:09] Okay. Thank you Keeley. Thank you Rebecca. All right, Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:14] Thank you Chair. Just an observation about what we've heard and Vice-Chair Hassemer's question and the back and forth there kind of led me to thinking about this. When I first started on the GMT there was a couple years where we were talking about the rebuilding paradox quite a bit, where in the groundfish we were starting to encounter more yelloweye, more canary, as they were rebuilding but it took awhile for the assessment and the ACLs to catch up. So part of my mind, encountering and mortality of these charismatic megafauna are not good, but the fact that we're encountering more maybe that means that there's more of them out there. And as there are more of them out there we're going to see more of them. So maybe, this will shock some former coworkers, but trying to be glass half full and optimistic on this that maybe it does mean the population is improving. I do wonder in the future about some scalable limits because if we set these limits for 5, 10 years and there's 8, 10% population growth every year, pretty quickly our limits are going to be very outdated, inaccurate, compared to the numbers of whales that are out there. Nothing that we can do or should do right now, but just some thoughts that have, as we've been discussing this today and I was reading the documents over the last couple of weeks. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:50] Thank you Lynn. Well I can say from personal experience that 20 years ago you never saw a humpback whale off of Oregon, or very seldom. Okay, Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:01] Thank you Mr. Chair. And I appreciate the comments from Miss Mattes there. Just maybe a little more on that. Yeah, it got me to thinking about increasing numbers of whales and looking at the conservation recommendation Number 4 too, it pertains to the midwater trawl and analyzing in more detail the 2023 and the 2024 interactions, I think there was one each year that occurred there, and so those are the most recent. I don't know what additional analysis can be done that wasn't done for the BiOp, but at least there's some thinking there and along with what Miss Mattes was saying, that in looking at the conservation recommendation, analyze that, and provide some recommendations to minimize interactions. And minimizing

interactions might mean a larger number, but relative to the population, you know, the rate is what we're looking at could be less. So I hope that's taken into consideration, and it has to look at the distributional or the numeric aspects and what's happening out there. So I appreciate those things.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:29] Okay, anyone else? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:04:36] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just changing topics a little bit. I just wanted to make a couple of comments relative to the GAP Report and some suggestion to take some new data points from the fixed gear logbook. In my tenure on the ESA Workgroup, which I believe began in its inception in like 2013, collection of logbook data points has been one of the recommendations since the start. And what was holding us up was that we didn't have a fixed gear logbook, but we do now. I think the question now is, what is the fine balance between taking too much data or gathering things that are not helpful versus chasing too many protected specie resources needs, like hook numbers for stall and other things. So I think it's a very delicate balance. I do see some crossover between what the GAP proposed and what's in the conservation recommendations. I guess, I don't know, this is not an action, but just a discussion piece of is there something to explore here? Is there a few pieces of data that could help close some of these gaps that would better or provide less uncertainty in some of the expansions and better information moving forward? Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:49] Thank you Caroline. All right. I don't see any other hands. Jessi. oh, Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:05:59] Thanks. Thanks Chair, I was a little slow on that one. I just want to support the comment from Miss McKnight and wondered, especially now with the e-logbook, the ability to add fields to that kind of a system seems like it would be easier than when we were using paper logs and just want to put that in the ear of National Marine Fisheries Service if that additional data, I mean you can go so far and say, gee whiz, I wish we had this information. And so taking a careful look at what kind of additional information would be valuable, particularly when it's coming from industry saying we're willing to provide it and just need the space for it. So thanks for bringing that up.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:48] Thank you Heather. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:06:52] Thanks. I just, since that was sort of directed at me, I'll just say that we have been evaluating the electronic logbook since the BiOp was concluded about what additional fields we may provide. I was in the GAP discussion and I appreciate their report about this and I appreciate the additional context around how they would imagine that data be used. I've continued to tack back to as Miss McKnight noted that we want to be very judicious in our data fields that we collect on the logbook, ensuring that we are collecting pieces of data that are going to be used. So I think with that framework we have already been evaluating what came out of the BiOp for potential changes to the logbook. And we will certainly add the GAP Report and that additional weight given to those considerations. And we'll update the Council in the future as we look at that logbook data collection.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:51] Thank you Keeley. All right. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:07:54] Thank you Mr. Chair. And this is to Keeley. I just wanted to clarify too, like I think there are limitations in changes to data fields related to the Paperwork Reduction Act, but I don't if there's any....yeah, if you could comment on flexibility there? Yeah, if there's easy flexibility to expand data fields or not related to existing requirements?

Brad Pettinger [00:08:18] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:08:25] Thanks. We always will evaluate the existing record-keeping and reporting requirements and the extent to which the scope of any changes are already covered or whether they would require an additional review under the Paperwork Reduction Act, so that would be part of our normal evaluation of any change. And I appreciate you highlighting it and we will take it into consideration.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:53] Okay, thank you Keeley. No more hands. Jessi, how are we doing?

Jessi Waller [00:08:59] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think you've completed your action for today. You had some discussions around the BiOp after the presentation and provided some comments and had that discussion with Miss Kent of the National Marine Fisheries Service, so I think you are good to go.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:13] All right, thank you. We have plenty of action left later on today, but we're going to take a break for 10 minutes.

3. Implementation of the 2025 Pacific Whiting Fishery Under the U.S./Canada Agreement and 2025 Fishery

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, the public comment, and takes us to our Council discussion and action. For a refresher it is up on the screen before us, Discuss Implementation of the 2025 Pacific Whiting Fishery Guidance to NMFS Regarding the 2025 Whiting TAC and Expectations for the 2025 Pacific Whiting Fishery Including At-Sea Set-Aside Management. So I paused there for a while so you could gather thoughts. And I believe Ryan Wulff will start the discussion here.

Ryan Wulff [00:00:46] Yeah, thank you. And I wanted to speak a little bit to the first two bullets and the GAP recommendation. I just wanted to note that regarding the upcoming JMC and the whiting meeting we did receive approval a few days ago to send Frank Lockhart, the NOAA representative there on the JMC, to the meeting next week, but because of the uncertainty around that and the delay in that, you know we have been working to set that up as a hybrid format. So we've been doing the best we can to ensure U.S. participation in that meeting and are looking forward to it next week. Getting to the GAPs points, I did want to note that NMFS is well aware that the timing of this meeting is unusual this year, and I wanted to reiterate, we will make every effort to return to the normal late February timeframe in the future. So this is an exception this year. This is not what we anticipate how it will be going forward, so I appreciate the GAPs comment and we are committed to that going forward. And then second, you've already heard me and Miss Quan talk about our regulatory freeze so I won't go into detail on that, but I just did want to acknowledge the GAPs second bullet there and note we are doing our best to get our rulemakings out so we can open the fishery on time. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:23] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:28] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I want to thank the GAP and Heather for the honesty in the comments and the effort to reflect the discussion that was in the GAP room and the greater sentiment that's going on right now. I definitely showed up. I inherited this issue from, you know I wasn't around as it was building and mounting and so I'm definitely coming to it. I'm going to try to balance here. I'm trying to stay on the Council side of it and be a Council member here rather than bringing forward so much of my role as a PWCC Executive Director and cooperative management. So I'm going to try to balance that careful line to walk. And then I'm going to take some opportunity to address the items that the GAP brought up in their report. I wasn't there for the entire discussion and we did not have CP representatives there. I didn't think that it was going to get this deep but here we are, and bear with me on the length of this comment. I think that we need to have a thorough discussion of this here. And I'm going to do some work to tie the comments that came up today back to Gary Ripka and Jeff Lackey's comments that they raised at the start of this meeting because I think their testimony was really important around shortspine. So the GAP, yeah, the three sections of the report, I'll divide my talking right here now into those sections, data reporting, annual reports, and then catch expectations for 2025. And I'm going to kind of work in terms of increasing urgency. I think the urgency around 2025 expectations is the highest to me. For Council data reporting, I think the GAP Report reference pro rata amounts that aren't codified in regulation right now and so establishing any kind of reporting around regulation, or around numbers that aren't reflected in regulations I think needs additional conversation and collaboration with all the members who are affected by that reporting in the room. So I don't know that it's appropriate for the Council to make that decision right now without additional thought. For

Council for annual reports I appreciated the GAPs discussion of the regulations that require motherships and catcher processors to submit vessel-by-vessel landings to NMFS and the Council. I noted earlier that there are lots of forms of reporting that are available and I noted this in the GAP, but PWCC and the catcher processor sector met the obligations to submit vessel-by-vessel information to NMFS and to the Council not for public viewing. As part of our application package, our annual reporting for 2023, we plan to do the same thing this year. Council members, you have our full report, our full unredacted report in your briefing book so you have that information available. And the GAP, I mean sorry, yeah the GMT also has that information available inseason as part of their ability to look at and evaluate the fishery and evaluate what's going on. And we're going to keep up with that obligation the way that it is asked for in the regulations. The discomfort there, this discomfort for me was in displaying that information to the public. And I'm still not clear that there is a conservation and management benefit to displaying the information on a vessel-by-vessel basis to the public. We do not require that of any other sector. And I'm....if there is a conservation and management issue that I'm missing, I would be happy to discuss it and be happy to adjust our reporting to make sure that we're meeting those obligations, but right now the PacFIN Report, the inseason information that's available to managers is all there. And again, yeah just think about it, we aggregate to three vessels in every other case and so I don't see why that wouldn't apply here and how this really benefits how we manage these fisheries. And the CPs I know absolutely don't want to create a conservation and management concern by withholding information. But I do encourage the Council community to articulate how revealing that data on a vessel-by-vessel level really supports the decisions that you guys make, especially when that information is coming out post-season. And I do think....I had some conversations with folks. There is some lack of consistency between our reports. One of the discussions that I heard is like this ability to see how much, like in real time and very easily, what mothership and catcher-processor catch is compared to the at-sea set-asides, PacFIN does that. This year it was masked because of confidentiality issues. And I hear that the mothership sectors did sign waivers to release that information so that it can be shown at the aggregate mothership cooperative level on PacFIN. And I think people are looking for this easy way to see where that catch is coming from, more so than the vessel-by-vessel detail for every single species that we catch. I don't know that that's the thing that we need. So maybe the Council can think about what pieces of information for that pure comparison are necessary for you all to make your decisions and for the public to feel like can be part of the decisions too. I think, you know there is a world where a simple table that describes our catch against the at-sea set-asides for each sector may accomplish this without posting vessel-by-vessel information for every single sector. So I see the opportunity coming up in the future through our discussions around the catch share review as a place for the Council to make that clarification around our reporting requirements, build the regulations in a way that match Magnuson, and don't share excessive information that isn't necessary for the Council to appropriately manage the fisheries. I think I just want to be clear that I'm trying to be protective around confidentiality for individual vessels and ask if that standard is being applied fairly in this case. So I want folks to hold that into their head. For at-sea sector catch and expectations for next year, I can speak for the CPs, we are super concerned about shortspine too. It was a crazy year and this was my first year really going through co-op management for the fishery. And yeah, folks in the whiting fleet....I think you've heard them describe it before as this whack-a-mole of like which species is going to be the species of concern? I honestly had not really even thought about shortspine thornyhead or really connected as a species in the groundfish FMP until last year and then it has been the subject of my life for the last year so. And it will be something else this year. There will be some new concern. We do not want to constrain the other groundfish sectors' ability to operate in this fishery and that is of primary importance to us. We do not, the CPs do not want to make it so that another

sector cannot operate. And especially with the decreases in the shortspine allocation that are in place this year, I think folks know that we moved to a new system combined to a coastwide allocation, and the overall allocation came down from about 12 or 13 hundred, I can't remember the exact numbers, to 8 or 9 hundred for the ACL. So we are in a big crunch and we are seeing this species everywhere. There is a...Heather mentioned some things about distribution of catch earlier that it's sort of more of a nearshore thing, but there is in the Catcher-Processor Annual Report that I submitted to the briefing book, there's a picture of how, what our experience was across the at-sea sectors of encountering shortspine thornyhead this year and it was everywhere, it was all over the place. So this is not an issue of just moving out of the way to deal with it. We're going to run into it over and over again. the IFQ fleet is going to have the same issue that we are. So I know there was no risk to the ACL but that there was pain anyways, and there's this broader context of the IFQ system and how we deal with scarcity in this fleet, how we deal with a lack of fish for any species, and again, I think you heard that reflected in Mr. Ripka and Mr. Lackey's comments earlier in this week. I also want to note that this was our most challenging whiting year in a long time. I know Heather mentioned that we were able to attain our quotas in past years. Last year was not the same. We suffered and are scared for this upcoming year that we're not going to attain all of our whiting catch. And then if we're further constrained by catch species, these very large platforms that employ a lot of people will suffer. We will not be able to catch anything. And then especially with moving away from shortspine in a way that we're going to need to stay under that allocation, we're not going to catch all of our whiting allocation. I don't know that the IFQ sector is going to catch all of their fish. And attainment is a really, really scary issue across all of these things. None of us are making money. And in all of this I hear a lot of frustration, like in the GAP Report it's frustration. Heather expressed frustration. I hear a lot of issues of fairness here and I'll point folks to National Standard 4, that's our fairness, our fairness guideline. And it's our job as a Council to weigh that fairness and think about that fairness in our work. And then, yeah, I want to put a finer point on that. The at-sea sectors don't have a hard cap, but each individual IFQ vessel does in this case. They have to....and the way that the mothership sector is choosing to operate right now too, they have these sort of caps that they're dealing with. So even though there isn't a at-sea set-aside cap for us, there are caps in the system that are affecting a lot of other people. And so there is this unfairness and this imbalance and I would be pissed off too and so I get it, I get that anger. So yeah, again we've had that benefit of flexibility and I think what we should be seeking here as a Council is in these constraining times to afford that flexibility to more folks. Like is there a way to... are there ways that we can adjust the system to make it more fair for everybody right now? I know from some outside discussions that I've been having with the GAP and other groups that there are creative solutions that we could work on to address that acute issue this year. I don't think that that will solve everything, but I want to encourage the Council to think creatively about how to do this. I encourage the GAP to bring up those ideas under the future workload items that we have coming up later today, or not today, sorry later this week throughout. And I wanna be able to think about ways to bring relief to everyone as quickly as possible, but I also want to highlight we're in a deregulatory environment with reduced staff so we're going to have to be more creative about how to deal with these things, but I don't know, I started with the reporting issues because I don't think that that's where the importance is. I think the importance is around all the scarcity issues that were raised and want to sit there with the discussion. So how can we create flexibility for everybody, and I welcome other thoughts people have.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:22] Thank you Aja. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:27] Yeah, in the earlier question to the GAP there was a point I think that, or an issue that Corey raised about what's different this year than last year given that we're catching about what the quota is going to be. And I think that, I think when you inject scarcity into an issue it changes everybody's behavior. You know catch share program we have a lot of fish available to us. Some of you aren't targeting, someone needs some fish you'll give it to them because you're not going to be left without your own fish to cover your individual operation. And I think that we've seen in the last couple of years that a couple of things that kind of replicate, kind of what we're talking about, that'd be toilet paper and eggs. Obviously people want to hoard it because they don't want to go without toilet paper for obvious reasons, and eggs because it's a big part of our diet. And so and I think that's kind of what's happening in the quota system here. I mean, obviously people were looking at the shortspine and they're going, whoa hold on here. On top of that the trawl survey is showing twice as much biomass they're interacting with or catching than they were just three or four years ago. And so it just makes it just a tough situation. Canary is the same thing, right? It's....and I think that these set-asides have worked pretty well, even when we haven't had, people haven't met quota expectations. But this year it's a different animal. I mean canary is going to basically shut down most of the shelf for folks for the year I think as far as be limited, people won't be fishing up till what you would like to see them participating in. Shortspine is going to constrict people. It's just going to be a tough, tough year and my fear is that if the set-asides get abused you're going to go over the ACL and I'm kind of curious, I would turn to Ryan Wulff and I would ask him what happens when the ACL is blown out of the water on a set-aside situation? I mean we've got over darkblotched, it's not been a big deal because we have plenty of darkblotched. But given on, I mean I look at probably more canary maybe an issue maybe than shortspine as far as blowing things up, but what happens this year when the ACLs have gone over and the IFQ fishery still has quota in their accounts?

Pete Hassemer [00:17:28] Ryan Wulff. Trying to pause so you can think about that question.

Ryan Wulff [00:17:38] Yeah, thank you Chairman for the question. Well the IFQ fishery has a hard cap, right? So I guess the fishery would shut down. We would look at other actions for at-sea based on the risk to the ACL.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:02] Cory Niles.

Corey Niles [00:18:04] Not to jump around too much, but first before forgetting, thanks Ryan for your first....your statement about the order of the JMC and Council meetings being unusual this year and you're doing your best to not have that happen in the future. But a lot of really interesting discussion today in Brad's question, Aja's statements, and what we heard from the GAP and from Heather. I think there's a big room for improvement in how we do these, but the right place to take that up is in the catch shares review and intersector allocation review and the follow-on actions there or maybe the spex. Because there's some definitely, in my mind, there's ways we can improve for sure, but when people have been trying to think of different ways of doing it for as long as I've been here and longer and it's not an easy, easy answer, but I think I will....well I'll start by I think we are just generally impressed with how dedicated everyone is to managing bycatch. You know I started in this process back before these rationalization programs started and I remember the trip limit days and how hard it was to set the right allocations. I remember my eyes crossing at the spreadsheet that Mr. Burden used to run for the GMT and just how just uncertain our predictions were. And I've just been impressed by the IFQ folks in both co-ops. And I think Aja said it, it's been a different species popping up. For example, shortbelly is always the ones that I was just like,

okay I'll just believe anything now. I never thought that was going to be an issue. But what I'm trying to get to is Heather Mann's question of, is it okay for them to go over the set-aside? And the thought is that we have just left the expectations, again, with room for improvement there. Because my answer to her question is in a lot of cases, yes, you should be able to go over the set-aside, but I don't think we've laid out clearly what those situations are, and I understand and feel guilty for the lack of a better word of not making those expectations more clear. But I think what a set-aside means foremost is that we don't have to address it within the season unless the conservation circumstances require us to do so, and that's....and thanks for Council staff for putting the regulations into the Situation Summary or to one of the attachments. And I still think the language and regulations is pretty pretty vague and it can need some room for improvement. I think Brad just asked the question of like what happens, like you mentioned darkblotched, yeah it's been okay because we're clearly under the ACL, but what if everyone's fears about shortspine come to fruition this year and we're approaching the ACL? You know I believe the National Standard guidelines say something about going over your ACL more than once in a four-year period. So would we even need to worry about going over the ACL once inseason? I think it's going to be really context dependent, but my point here is that, yeah the expectations are unclear and I do see that the different sectors' approaches are different and it's partly as those, it's part of the unclear expectations. So, and then if we go over by the ACL by one metric ton, that's one thing, if we go over by 100 metric tons, that's another. So I think, yeah, the gist of my statement is here, we need to do more thinking on this and it doesn't just affect the trawl sectors. You know Brad says canary is going to be different this year because people are going to behave differently, but in the past we've....not too....we were just last year the trawl sectors have been, you know, the IFQ sector, you know, by everyone behaving rationally to protect themselves against lightning strikes has come in at 60% of their allocation, and yet our recreational sectors are coming up against their canary allocations. So that's another situation we need to address. And I think, again, the place we can do that is when we get to the review of our catch shares and allocations. I think I have some other thoughts that I'm losing track of here, but yes I'm hearing the frustrations and worries and about the constraints that could be coming in this year and I think we are really wanting to figure out how to improve the flexibility and this behavior of needing insurance for some low probability events.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:41] Thank you Corey. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:46] Thank you Vice-Chair. I was on the GMT when we went from hard caps with this sector to the set-asides, and as a recreational fisheries manager at the time my sector was being held to, they were being treated as hard caps. When something happened, if you approached it, thou shalt and you will do something and we have taken action. And at the time I was pretty frustrated by that. As I've seen how this operates and with the rapidly changing global climate, I guess we don't say climate change, the rapidly changing ocean conditions, the differences we are seeing, things we heard in the EWG Report yesterday, having an opportunity or an option for our sectors to be flexible and nimble I think is going to be more and more important as we move forward. Things are not going to be able to wait for a three-meeting Council process and then six to eight months for reg deeming and all of that. So ideally being able to keep the opportunity for sectors to have the set-asides and try to work together I think is important. I do agree with Mr. Niles that I think we may need to take a look at this as we do the trawl review and intersector allocation. My hope is in the meantime folks can find a way to have some communication and play nice in the sandbox together. I had another thought but it just escaped me, but I do believe the flexibility and nimbleness of the set-asides is important to allow those two sectors to work together hopefully, or within each sector to adjust to what they're seeing on the water each year depending

on are the whiting north? Are they south? Are they deep? Are they shallow? And the whack-a-mole game we keep hearing about. I think the set-aside is better able to accommodate that than maybe a hard cap would. That's not to say I wouldn't love to have something like that for the Oregon recreational fishery. Maybe we'll be able to explore that at some point. So those were just my thoughts as we've had this discussion. Yeah, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:10] Thank you Lynn. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:26:16] Well thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I agree with what Miss Mattes said totally, and I bet when this, the spirit of these were set up it was intended for people to go in the room together, maybe take out the sharp objects and work it out. And I always have said and always felt it's a lot better if the fishermen can work it out between them than us working it out for them. And I'm so hoping that maybe it's time to take the sharp objects out of the room and maybe the chairs even and sit down and have the sectors work this out because I would hate to channel Mr. Anderson, the great Mr. Anderson Councilman, but I'm sure he had expectations when they were set up that this would be worked out between the groups and policed by the groups and I sure hope that we don't have to have a big, foldy roll, three-year, four-year process or whatever it takes, it usually takes for these things that I'm sure hoping that they can go and work this out and figure it out because I think it's better for all concerned if that can happen. So anyway, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. My half a cent for the day.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:50] Thank you Butch. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:27:55] Yeah, thank you. I've heard a couple comments related to what might happen if we think we're at risk of exceeding the ACL. So I just wanted to note per our regulations inseason action can be taken regarding at-sea set-asides if there's a risk of a harvest specification being exceeded, unforeseen impact on other fisheries, or conservation concerns. We do have limited actions available inseason which have already been analyzed, so this would probably be a block area closure and NMFS doesn't have automatic authority to take an action for this purpose between Council meetings, so we would need or we would look to the Council to make that recommendation. Probably it could be as early as a June agenda item. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:44] Thank you Ryan. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:28:51] Yeah, thanks. I'm sorry to indulge again, but I did forget one important thing I want to say, and I could respond to what Ryan said. I still think that's, it's a can, a may, and when is the conservation cost? But I guess just to try to get out of what's in my head and not coming out of my mouth very well is where I get uncomfortable is.....I think what, and Butch triggered this thought is, yes it's what we've enjoyed is people managing their own affairs and working it out themselves. I think where I get uncomfortable is then trying to referee between whose methods of achieving their performance measures are better or not without having any kind of our standard evaluation of the data, asking the GMT and other analysts to like, okay is this measure effective or not? That's how we used to do it with the trip limits and et cetera. So that's just where my nervousness is. I hear what is the various viewpoints, and yeah if we're going to be asked to referee, that's kind of going back the old way of doing things. And I don't know that we have the data to really analyze this just given how variable it is. But that's something I left out of my previous statements and I just wanted to highlight that as we...I would take it seriously if this Council were to ask to make a decision on which measures work best, and that we'd want to do that with data

and deliberation. The last thing, and the at-sea sectors as we've seen over there, they have a lot better data I think than even the managers do on the spatial aspects of, and some really talented people helping them analyze it, not that, you know on par with our folks that we have here.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:55] Thank you Corey. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:00] Uh, yeah. I think as far as what the expectations are this year, I would hope that we have some transparency and communication. I think sunlight is the best disinfectant as far as issues like this, a public resource. I'm not quite sure why the individual vessel reporting is that big of a deal. I mean, you don't have to but I know in the IFQ program I can go online and I can find out to a pound what every IFQ boat caught during the year if you use an Excel spreadsheet. It's pretty simple, you know in five minutes. And I'm kind of curious if that's just.....if you go with the vessel ID maybe you can just remove the name, just vessel 1234. I mean it'd be kind of interesting just to see what if there's....is it one boat that is the issue? Is it two boats? I mean, is everybody catching the same amount? I just, I don't know. It'd be nice to know what the move-along rules are. I look at the mothership as far as their co-op and they've got guidelines as far as you catch too much what do you know? I could find that information out pretty easy what the rules are. So I think it'd be good Aja I think if we could actually understand how that works on the CP section, sector, because we are in a situation where there's just not much quota to go around and they can be easily blown up and I just, it scares me and I don't want to go there. As far as the ACL coming under, I think the, actually if I remember last few years, I think the recreational fleet's been coming under on the carry also. I mean, in my mind, I think what we really need to do is we need to figure, we had a discussion as early as this week about a big sea carryover. And there's got to be some real flexibility that we should have without going over the long term removals of the, prescribed by the science folks what those, you know not go over, take too much fish out of the ocean, not overfish over a two-year period. I won't get into that right now, but I think there's some flexibility here. And Aja you've mentioned some options maybe you're thinking about that I think I'm certainly interested in. But I think this is going to be a tough year and I'm just, I'm worried. So anyway I just hope everybody, you know, I know it's tough. I mean the fleet does an outstanding job overall, really, for minimizing the catch of most of the stocks we're concerned about and it's not easy. And I'll just stop there and we'll see what happens. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:49] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:33:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. If I may I'd like to ask Ryan a question or two about his remarks back on the regulations? Looking at Attachment 1 and the actual regulatory language and the management being on an annual basis unless there's a risk of a harvest specification being exceeded, unforeseen impact on other fisheries, or conservation concerns. My first question is, is NMFS watching and would you consider acting outside the realm of, or without a Council recommendation, because you mentioned June. But hoping you might elaborate on what your thoughts might be, explain some context for us. Also, when I'm thinking about a harvest specification, I'm thinking about an OFL or an ABC, maybe not an ACL. But I'm hoping you can elaborate for us on that. And if an inseason action would be taken, could it be taken on only the at-sea sectors independent of the shoreside sector and non-trawl sectors? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:23] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:35:32] Yeah, thank you Miss Yaremko for the questions. I mean yes NMFS is watching, right? I can answer that one easy. But we can't do an inseason for trawl outside of a Council meeting. You know we would need an emergency Council meeting or something. That's why I laid out the regulations, the automatic authority question. You can do inseasons that are gear and sector specific but you need a Council meeting or something. That's at least the only flexibility we've kind of evaluated so I hope that's helpful. We also have GC and others online if need be.

Pete Hassemer [00:36:13] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:36:21] I have another question that's totally different. I just want to make sure there weren't any follow-ups on that thread.

Pete Hassemer [00:36:29] I haven't seen any follow-ups neither online or around the room, so go ahead with your next question.

Marci Yaremko [00:36:37] Thank you, this one's easier. I guess a question for Merrick, we received three informational reports in the briefing book on the performance of the 2024 co-ops and appreciate those reports. I was just wondering, Aja spoke to the CP reports, but why were they not included in the briefing book under this agenda item and were we offered an opportunity to question Kristin McQuaw on her reports?

Merrick Burden [00:37:17] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Excuse me. And appreciate the question. In terms of why they weren't put under this agenda item, I guess I don't have a good answer. It could go either way. We didn't see anything actionable on those reports and I think that might have played into our thinking about them being informational rather than under this agenda item. I would also call your attention to....you also, as Miss Szumylo mentioned, the confidential version of the CP Report is available to you as Council members, and that is in the, there's a confidential section in the Council member dashboard. So that's there for you if you want to see it. I think there's a lot of information that flies through your inbox during a Council meeting and so that message may have been buried in there. Your other question about whether we could ask about the mothership co-op report, we haven't arranged for that but I think there are members here of the mothership sector that may be able to answer some of the questions if you wanted to invite them back to the table.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:33] Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:38:33] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice Chair. I would ask anyone who might want to speak to the mothership report?

Pete Hassemer [00:38:48] And it looks like Miss Sarah Nayani was elected to do that.

Sarah Nayani [00:38:57] Thank you Vice-Chair and Council members and thank you Marci. I'm a board member of the Whiting Mothership Cooperative. I am not the appropriate person to be responding. That would be our co-op Manager Kristin McQuaw. But since this was not agendized I can do my best having done no preparation for these responses that I'm about to give.

Marci Yaremko [00:39:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you and I do appreciate you coming up and if you can't answer my question, because it is fairly technical in nature, I would

understand and just maybe answers can come later. I'm looking on page 3 and discussing the content of the tables, and it mentions that a cell with zero point zero metric tons indicates a trace amount of the species was caught, and that a blank cell indicates no amount was caught. And then it indicates that some species weren't included because there was no catch reported. Salmon are reported in numbers of fish, while halibut, d crab, and eulachon are reported in metric tons. That's clear enough, but when I get down to, and I'm just going to use the example on page 10, we see in the list of species we see steelhead and then we see zero point zero zero in every cell in that row and I'm trying to understand if that means there's a trace amount that was caught by every vessel and if it's.....I guess I was just hoping to learn a little bit more because I think everything else is reported in pounds and not numbers of fish. Thank you.

Sarah Nayani [00:41:14] Through the Vice-Chair, thank you Miss Yaremko. My understanding was also that if it said point zero-zero that there might be some number beyond that. I think this might be either a reporting issue where zeros were just provided here instead of being blanked out, or it could be a situation where there's some strange observer extrapolation that somehow got applied at a fishery level. So I will ask our co-op, or basically like I'll ask our co-op manager to follow-up with you and other Council members if that's of concern, because I do think that is confusing in that particular, those particular cells.

Marci Yaremko [00:41:58] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you. I'd appreciate that.

Pete Hassemer [00:42:07] All right. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:42:08] Yeah, and I just want to add to that point and question. I do think that there is some room for like greater consistency across the report. My experience in putting together the report was sort of after what had been put together in previous years. But I do recognize that our reports are really different, even the kind of reporting that you discussed there. I think I'm not.....in how I present the data I think we should be parsimonious in how that information is displayed. So I think there is like, I think there is room for improvement on the reports. I still take umbrage with the vessel-by-vessel reporting. If the vessel-by-vessel current catch for IFQs is actually available online, everyone should have signed a waiver for that, like that is not okay. It's not okay under Magnuson. I'm trying to get people on that particular issue to be concerned about data protection for themselves. So that's one thing, but I do think that there is a lot of room for us to like gain connection on how we're displaying information and sharing that across the reports.

Pete Hassemer [00:43:16] Thank you. I just want to note that Ryan Wulff had to leave the room. Keeley Kent is in the chair. She is online with us. She is now in the NMFS Chair as we proceed with our discussions. I just wanted to highlight that. I think you can stand down Sarah. Thank you very much. And let's go to Chair Pettinger and then Corey Niles.

Brad Pettinger [00:43:57] Well maybe I just express maybe kind of where I think we need to be before we leave here. I'd just say that as far as guidance from the Council in this situation it's basically that that guide should be the Council could...we could provide to the at-sea sectors that it would be that the Council expects the sectors to make every effort to manage its fisheries to the respective pro rata share of the set-asides, particularly those that are fully allocated, and if they can't there's a commitment to communicate with the other sector, and if they anticipate they are going to exceed their pro rata share, they not only communicate with the other sector but communicate to the National Marine Fisheries Service what steps they are taking to minimize their

overage of the pro rata share of the set-aside. I think that's kind of the communication and transparency that I was mentioning. I think that's kind of what we want to see because these numbers are so low that we can't play around this year. I don't know if everybody else feels that way but that's kind of where I'm at.

Pete Hassemer [00:45:21] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:01] I think you said it better before of if we go over at this point where we have expectations, if people abuse the set-asides we're going to step in and say sorry we can't let you have this discretion anymore, but it's going to come post-season unless the conservation circumstances require us to take inseason action. So I think we're telling people in my mind, we want you to take these calculations very seriously. Just for a hypothetical example that I don't even want to say because, but let's just say....I think, well I'll just use the example that I think Aja kind of got at where let's say the, and I hope the motherships get all of their allocation of the TAC this year, but let's say they're not going to fish in the fall and they're only at 50 percent of their allocation. Why would the CPEs, what's the conservation benefit of requiring the CPEs to stay within their pro rata share of the set-aside? Just as a hypothetical, because the motherships aren't going to need it. That would be covered by your communication part I would think. So I'm just, part of me like why in that circumstance, why would we cost the CPs, you know in both, I show that both sectors recognize they spend, Heather said millions, and I didn't want to guess that before, but she said millions of dollars managing bycatch and I believe it, so why would we cost them, you know, significant economic loss in a situation where we're not needing to keep them to their pro rata share? Hopefully that came out clear, like why would we do that?

Brad Pettinger [00:01:51] I think it's.....we would like them to. We understand, I think we understand that we're not....the set aside shared gives the flexibility to, because some people are over on other, on some species and some on others, I think it's to give.... basically if we hit that spot, it's basically what are the actions you're doing to keep within it and do the best, and so we understand you're doing the best you can with a public resource, because it's going to affect the other people, not only the other at-sea folks, but also the IFQ fishery. And so I think it's basically it's just we're articulating this is what we'd like to see so we understand that everybody's doing their best to make sure they're managing the fish that's available to the fleet. This is transparency. That's all I'm asking.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:49] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:55] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I was actually okay with the way Brad stated it too. Yeah, again what I'm hearing there is like we try as hard as we can to stay within our pro rata share. You know if we communicate, and our communication with each other it sounds like the mothership fleet isn't going to fish later on in the year. This is a hypothetical. I'm not talking about a real situation. But the way you get past that pro rata share in a case where our fishing practices are going to be different is through really careful communication with each other. And our plan, shortspine is in a whole different, a whole different ball of wax this year, so our plan is to be careful in a way that we were not last fishing year. And you know I'm reflecting here a really new understanding I have of the impact in any situation on the other sectors, like that people change their vessel operations, that people act differently knowing that the overall picture could result in an ACL overage, for example. So yeah, I think that that statement is fine, the way that Brad articulated it is fine. I do still think that we need to seek flexibility for everyone. Like I think that

there's still a missing piece here. If we keep.... when we are encountered with these new situations where there's like ultra-scarcity, we should be able to be, the Council should be seeking ways that we can create flexibility for everyone rather than like seeking to clamp down everybody more. And what I sense here is that these clamps, the scarcity is creating the tension. If there was another species for which there was not this ACL concern the conversation wouldn't be the same, and if there was abundant fish everywhere the conversation wouldn't be the same. But with shortspine this year we have a different kind of concern and we'll make every effort to stay underneath our mount and communicate really actively with the other sector the same way that we did last year and the same way that I have been doing. And yeah, I want to pull salmon away from this discussion of set-asides. Salmon is a whole different, and we all know it is the most important one, it is different and we do not treat salmon in the same way. that one....yeah, not only are the bycatch dynamics different for that one, but we prioritize that species differently. And to make it clear to the Council, the whack-a-mole that I was talking about is there could be situations where in order to avoid salmon you end up running into other bycatch species, or with same thing, maybe to avoid shortspine you run into something else, so that is the whack-a-mole that these vessels are working across that sometimes avoidance, avoidance isn't a zero sum game, it sometimes results in additional catch of something else, so it is a big challenge. And again, that gets me back to if we hear about clamps, tight places in the system, is there a way to create flexibility for everyone so that we're not running into the situation that Corey mentioned where we have unused allocation that could benefit catching more abundant species for other people. So how can we facilitate that as a Council around the species that come up as really big concerns? And for this year, that is shortspine and canary and many other things but.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:42] Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:06:43] Thank you, and I appreciate this discussion and civility because it's difficult. What I'm hearing, though, is everybody that's in this fishery agrees that they'd rather not have hard caps. That's a good driver for working towards a solution. I think Butch mentioned having the folks involved in this go off and discuss it. Again, the driver is if something doesn't work out this time, next time, whatever, then something else could happen to everybody. So that's the driver and I do hope that in that spirit these folks can make some progress without us around. Thank you Chair. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:27] Thank you. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:07:28] Well quick response, yeah thank you for those thoughts Rebecca. I think they're very much in line. But if Brad and Aja are good with openness and transparency for now, I think that's where we leave it. I could go on about if the representative who used to be in Rebecca's seat, we might be arguing about what the word 'practicable' means versus trying your hardest, but I don't want to do that today. But the.....I do think if this Council is going to be asked to weigh-in, you know it's going to be really specific circumstances. And if we're going to be asked to do that in June I don't see that happens. And last comment Brad, just on the recreational fisheries, I didn't mean to suggest that they have been going over necessarily but it did cause some, especially in the Washington recreation, not especially, but in our Washington recreational fishery, canary, we had an unexpected large catch and it does affect a lot of....all of our deliberations and our planning and the recreational fisheries having watches for years are as diligent as the trawl sectors in keeping to their quotas and they are also affected, just to clarify my comment there.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:49] Thank you Corey. So with that, let me try and summarize. We've been at this for a long time, a lot of discussion. Eventually I will turn to Todd to give us some thoughts. But what I heard here is there was a lot of umbrella or overarching discussion about how we would like to see things in the future and flexibility, and that's very good and it's important and we need to keep that in our minds. There's also the piece today, our action is consideration of the 2025 whiting season, and in the shorter term what does the Council want to see? Here's where I'm going to try and summarize and I'm just going to walk through the Council tasks there and maybe cover a little bit regarding implementation of the whiting fishery. The GAP recommendation there was discussion, the May 1 start date, at least that part of it. I'm not sure what else I heard, that's where I'll look to Todd for some additional stuff. Guidance to NMFS regarding the TAC, maybe the piece that wasn't specific to 2025, but the GAP recommendation. And NMFS said they would try in the future make sure that JMC meeting occurs prior to this Council meeting. We're in a unique situation this year. I don't know that I have heard anything else regarding the TAC for this year, so there's still some room if the Council would like to weigh-in on that. The third piece there, I think took up most of our time in discussing this, is what are the Council's expectations for this year? And as I said, a lot of that discussion got intertwined with flexibility in the overarching management, but I did hear some agreement on openness and transparency, and I'm trying to look at my notes here, careful communication through the season. That's nothing that's hardwired in here. That's a Council expectation for what would happen. There's an expectation. I'm going to walk out on a limb here a little bit about paying attention to pro rata shares, which are not hardwired into any system, but that ties in with the communication that we heard, that be cognizant of what's happening, and again it comes back to the communication, the expectation. So that's what I heard expressed as some of the Council expectations. It's not any formal motion or anything like that, that's your expectations for what would happen. Another piece I'm going to mention that I heard through the discussion that worries me a little bit, maybe it's not so bad, is the individual, the vessel by vessel reporting on what's happening and the need for that. Number 1, it's in the Code of Federal Regulations. It's a regulation. I didn't hear it here and I hope I wouldn't that the Council take the position don't worry about that. It's a regulation. We pay attention to it. We're in a deregulatory environment but it's still in the regulation. The discussion was how is that reporting available to us? and what I heard is for the Council members, the vessel by vessel reporting is available. Maybe in the future there's a need that it should be more widely accessible, but it was reported that way. I haven't been able to run back there and look. I looked at the informational reports in detail, but I guess I'm just putting the caution out there that when we talk about these things, I think Miss Szumylo mentioned that aspect of is there a conservation and management need? And it's a good question from my perspective. I can get into that discussion. It's not necessary now, but right now there's a regulation that says we'll do it. My understanding is that it has been reported that way and it's available to us. So I probably said a lot more than I should so Todd, is there more and I'm not shutting off discussion yet, but before you do Todd, I probably said something that the Executive Director would like to respond to.

Merrick Burden [00:14:09] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. Before we go to Todd I did just want to add some I think clarity in the interest of just making sure we're all on the same page about Item Number 2 in particular. This is a slightly different process than we have had over the last few years given the timing of the Whiting Treaty process and the meeting next week. I had a chance to talk with Mr. Phil Anderson here over the last couple of days. As a reminder, he is the Council's representative to that Whiting Treaty Forum. And so in terms of Number 2 and how things will unfold there, my advice to you all is that we give Mr. Anderson maximum flexibility to engage in those negotiations with his Canadian counterparts. Phil is a trusted member of this family and I

think a very astute negotiator. There was also some talk about what happens if the treaty negotiations do not reach an agreement. I think that same logic would apply to Phil advising NMFS if an agreement is not reached and advising NMFS on behalf of the Council. I think that is a logistical matter. If the Council wanted to respond in some way we would have to wait until the April Council meeting. That would delay the fishery. I think a lot of things start to unravel at that point. So I guess my consultations with Phil and advice to him is to proceed with maximum flexibility and try to represent the Council as best he can. And I think that's our way forward unless I hear you advise otherwise.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:05] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:16:07] I do have thoughts on the TAC, and consistent with those I was just waiting for the set-aside discussion to end. So I don't know if you want to get Todd or jump into that. I also had a question about the regulation you wrote up Pete, but if you were looking for Todd to summarize first I will hold off.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:25] I was going to ask him to summarize our progress here, but it sounds like you have something to add regarding Number 2. So before we summarize it let's make sure we've heard everything we need. Go ahead.

Corey Niles [00:16:40] Well just starting with what Merrick left off. Yeah, totally agree that it's Phil, but it's also Frank Lockhart and Steve Joner and Brent Payne, who a lot of us have known for a long time and know that they will listen to all the perspectives brought forward at the JMC from the AP and others. And so yeah at the same time I do think that this.....and thank you to Council staff for including the Whiting Assessment and SRG Report. I think this Council should also stay informed about what's going on with the stock assessment note. And it would be ideal to me if we could still get presentations on the science, the order of operations here again being odd, but I still think it's important for this Council to track what the assessment is saying. Do get nervous sometimes that we're taken away from what we would do in this Council in terms of the harvest control rules and how precautionary we are, but not with this current group. Definitely have the utmost confidence in them. But just a statement, I think we need to pay attention to the assessment and the science, WDFW does, ODFW does as well. So those are my thoughts about the TAC. It's a very interesting year with a lot of uncertainty about how many young fish are coming in and no survey. It's a every other year survey situation and this was an off year so it's going to be a tough one, but I'm agreeing with Merrick's general thoughts on how to proceed, but for the longer term also hoping that this Council will stay informed of what's going on with the assessment in the stock and the industry.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:41] David Sones.

David Sones [00:18:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I was kind of interested in that too. You know I've had a real concern with these high stock assessments, but nobody is seeing the fish on the water when the fisheries are taking place and I think that's probably some of the problems that might have been raised with the CP sector maybe having to go far deeper and closer to the bottom to find these fish because we're sure not seeing them close inshore. And it's important for our people up in the north because there's always this concern that they're getting corked by the fishery below them. And Canada raises the same concerns and I've tried to express to them that this wasn't a problem in the past. We had these higher stock assessments and the older age classes, they would

move up into our waters and that's when we expected to do well and we could have a lot of fishing pressure in our area and it didn't affect it, but we just haven't been seeing that but we've been getting these real high stock assessments where we're really anticipating to see fish in our area that year and they're just not showing up and I don't see any answers to why it's almost the opposite of the stock, you know, stock assessments being low and fishermen seeing fish all over the place. We're kind of reversed in that situation I think from what we're seeing out there now and so those stock assessment presentations are kind of important to maybe get at some of those questions and try and figure out what's going on here because it does create problems when we're don't know where to find the fish. You start looking in places that maybe we shouldn't be looking and bycatch starts doing all kinds of weird stuff. And it'd be nice to try and understand why we're seeing so much assessments and not on the grounds when we're actively fishing. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:40] Thank you. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:20:45] At a risk of continuing going on this. I do think it's really important to.....yeah I realize I may have heard more parsimony between me and Brad about how we should handle this, but I want to make sure that the understanding is there. We should be communicating as much as possible between the sectors and managing to the overall set-aside number. The pro rata number is something that we've discussed as internal communications with each other and an internal flag for us to communicate with each other that like something, you know we're, yeah if we get to a point where we're bumping up against that pro rata number, it's a flag for us to say, hey things are going differently than we expected and we need additional communication about how to move forward around this. It is not, you know, it's not an amount that we, that the Council is demanding that we necessarily keep to because it's not held in the regulations anywhere. And so I don't want to commit to managing exactly to that number. What I'm saying is that we will work together to communicate as we approach those numbers and speak to each other to ensure that we stay underneath the set-asides as much as we can. There may be times that we exceed the set-asides too and I want people to understand that as well. That may happen and I think Corey alluded to that too. It's a set-aside and it's a target to try to stay beneath, but the fishery conditions may....there may be times that we go past it. So I just want that understanding to be there. Again, shortspine is a really different thing this year and we are going to have really careful different attention around shortspine than we would around other species that do not have the same constraints. But I want to be clear in terms of communicating expectations from the Council really that set-asides may be exceeded sometimes. I think that's the thing that needs to come up and needs to be understood here. Or sorry, I would like clarity and understanding among Council members that that is something that may happen.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:15] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:23:18] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I've been listening intently to the set-aside discussion and whether there was any communication from the Council that the Council wanted to articulate to the various sectors, and as I heard the conversation what I heard agreement on was agreement about communication and transparency. And I'm sorry, my voice is having troubles today, but communication and transparency, but there are other suggestions that I don't think there was agreement on, and I think that's what you're raising Miss Szumylo. I heard our Chairman outline a process of communication if you reach a pro rata share of the set-aside. I didn't hear agreement on that suggestion. What I heard agreement on was communication and transparency, especially as the overall set-aside limit is getting, is being approached.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:23] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:24:23] Thank you, and we do, we have very.....yeah the one thing we were able to really get agreement on with each other between the sectors, we didn't succeed everywhere, but the one thing we really agreed on is exact, tight communication frameworks around the pro rata numbers. Like we are in lockstep around that communication. We have our own internal protocols for that. So yes, if you're speaking around communications, about how set-aside catch is going during the year, that is there and we commit to that very deeply, like we'll keep going with that communication. And yeah we're, the way that we are, we're paying attention, managing all of our fishing activities, absolutely. I didn't want this to bridge into the demand that catch has to stay underneath the set-aside, or underneath that pro rata number, because I don't think that that is the expectation. It's a shared set-aside number meant to reflect that fishing conditions change. We fish differently as different sectors and the trust is there for us to work together between the sectors to determine what that is. So I want it to be clear that that's, yeah that the pro rata number is around communication. It doesn't mean that each sector has to stay underneath that number because that is not what's in.....(loss of audio)..... And then, yeah the other piece is that again this understanding that the set-asides are set up that way because some years we may go past them. They're meant not to be hard caps for a reason to create that flexibility. And again, I think if flexibility is a... if flexibility is something that's really desirable for others as well, then I think that's the thing that the Council should seek to create for all the sectors, like how can we get to better flexibility for everybody? We are afforded it because the set-asides are not a hard cap. Are there places that we can afford that flexibility to some of the other sectors too rather than we clamp everybody, we get back to heart, little tiny boxes for everybody and risk OY for all of us because we're trying to tightly manage exactly to tiny boxes when there isn't a conservation concern.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:54] Okay, thank you. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:02] I think I got that. I just want to make sure that... I think we, I think people need to understand when you get there, we're getting close to it, what you're doing to minimize your catch so people, I mean, including the National Marine Fisheries Service as a loop. I just want to make sure that the best efforts are being undertaken. And I think the more communication we have, the more confident we are in what we got here. So I just....there's way too much at stake now and so the flexibility you're talking about, that's the things we can attain, or look to attain but this year, we did talking, and I think everybody needs to understand that everybody is doing their best efforts. And so as long as we're doing that then we'll do what we can, right?

Aja Szumylo [00:28:01] Commit to the best.....sorry, I'm sorry.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:05] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:28:05] We can commit to the best efforts and communicating what we're doing, absolutely.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:14] All right, thank you. Let's see if anybody disagrees with that expectation on communicating to the best of their abilities. And Corey you might have your hand up but I just want to put out there the reminder Executive Burden's suggestion getting back to these

things, Number 2 guidance. His suggestion was Mr. Anderson is your representative, the Council's representative to the JMC, to giving him the flexibility and to negotiate to the best of his abilities with the Council's interest in mind, if that's okay, rather than we can still intervene a special meeting of the Council, but at this point I think it was making sure that Mr. Anderson has some flexibility to negotiate on our behalf. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:29:26] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And I just add a little bit more flavor to my comments just in the interest of clarity, and I would say giving Mr. Anderson this flexibility is the usual course. Usually this has played out before the Council has met and decisions have been made in that forum, so this isn't new, it's just I thought it best to clarify all of this because of the confusion around how the process has unfolded in time for this year. So continuing to give him that clarity, I think, is the normal course of business.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:06] Any disagreement with that? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:30:13] Not disagreement, but just more elaboration maybe. But you mentioned needing a special meeting if the JMC didn't reach agreement, but just to articulate the thoughts, kind of maybe what Merrick said, I think if that were the case we wouldn't need a special meeting, because we, I think we would, well, this is speaking from my perspective, but we would already have faith that Phil and Brent and Steve already basically heard from all of the stakeholders, all the agencies who weighed-in and they would have a really good handle on what the Pacific Council's input would be in that situation where there was no agreement. So that's kind of the trust I think Merrick's speaking to. So I just...your example of needing a special meeting I just thought that was a good way of explaining it and Phil and NMFS both, and Steve and Brent would have a good sense of what the Council would say.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:19] Thank you. Let me turn to Todd and correct us all on that or tell us what you've heard.

Todd Phillips [00:31:24] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. To paraphrase your paraphrasing, looking at Items 1 and 2, and obviously Mr. Burden chimed in as well, the Council has essentially instructed or given guidance to Mr. Anderson and others who are representing the Council on the Pacific Whiting Treaty to go forth and negotiate with what they understand the Council's interest to be. So those two items I would say are, you've taken care of. Number 3, there was considerable discussion regarding at-sea set-asides, and just to reiterate what I heard is that it is mostly striving for the at-sea sectors to be open and transparent with one another as they move forward through the year regarding set-asides, regarding their plans, that sort of thing. And that is what I've heard sir.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:19] Thank you. Anything else here? Everybody comfortable? As I said this is rough. These are expectations. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:32:30] Not to...I did have one more thing on the set-aside. I just, again I believe that.....and I'm hearing things from Aja and Brad just having been here for years, I think they know all the circumstances that are going to raise those situations where the Council would step in to act either inseason by regulation or post-season by affecting another sector, blowing an ACL big time. I can't think of another conservation concern on the fly here, but I just want to say I have faith that

the sectors know when it's getting serious enough that the Council would really think about stepping in. I'm hearing a lot of what Aja is saying so I just wanted to make that statement.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:19] All right, thank you. All right, I'm going to look around and see if there's any other discussion, questions on people's minds regarding this? Let's take a five-minute break so we can make sure everybody's clear on this and then we will come back and wrap up our discussion.....(BREAK).....Appreciate everybody's patience here. We needed a little time to organize our thoughts. And coming out of that discussion I think Miss Szumylo had potentially or someone else? Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:34:12] I will try. So we discussed on the break and then, yeah this is just to sum it up for everyone again. Both sectors will strive to manage catch inseason as best we can. As we are approaching the pro rata set-aside we'll increase our communication with each other and then also share information about what we're doing to avoid catch, exceeding the set-aside overall, and to constrain catch. So it's...we are committed to additional communication throughout the season and as we're approaching the set-aside really to clarify what we plan to do to stem additional catch and keep the overall set-aside, keep our overall catch within the set-aside amount. The plans for what we will do are not set yet because we don't know what the year is going to be, like again this scheme of whack-a-mole, but that likely means a number of different measures that, and you guys can see these already, yeah for the Council's broader information, we do discuss the types of measures that we consider. They're largely movement-based, area closure-based, that kind of thing. We will communicate what kinds of measures we put in place to avoid catch going up any higher to the other sector manager and to NOAA as the season is going on and as we approach each bycatch issue. So really this is, we are deeply committed to additional communication, especially around those species where we have a constraining quota amount. So I think that's where we are. It's a communication-based agreement.

Pete Hassemer [00:36:02] All right, thank you for that clarification. Keeley Kent has her hand raised. Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:36:10] Thank you Vice-Chair. I did, and I apologize Aja, I had wanted to come back to a comment that Mr. Niles made, and I will try not to drag this out more, but what I heard from that was that everyone is clear on what will happen. I hear what you're saying, but I want to be clear with the Council on what NMFS perspective of what would happen if the Council felt like they needed to get engaged with a set-aside exceedance. And just reminding you that at this point we do not have automatic authority relative to the set-asides, so we will be looking for the Council to tell us explicitly whether or not the Council recommends an inseason if there is an at-sea set-aside exceedance. That could be set up in June. It could potentially be set up as an if then and we could talk about it more, but I wanted to be very clear on our end of what our expectation is. We certainly will continue to communicate with the co-ops. We do review and monitor the catch that is occurring between Council meetings, but we do not have much that we could do even if we wanted to do. What I'm hearing from the at-sea co-ops is that they intend to continue to monitor this very closely and so I'm hopeful we don't need to get into these details, but wanted to make sure that that is, that expectation is clear from us. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:30] Thank you Keeley. Checking around to see if there's further discussion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:37:42] Just to add back that smaller picture question on what you stated earlier about the regulations and the vessel level reporting. And this is a question for staff, I guess, or NMFS is the regulation that....well Pete you seem to be suggesting that we would need to repeal the regulation because it's, and maybe I heard too much in violation of the confidentiality rules, but does the regulation say that those reports have to be made public? Or is it just that they're submitted to NMFS and to the Council and like Executive Director said that that remains confidential if given to NMFS and Council members?

Pete Hassemer [00:38:23] Thank you. We'll go to General Counsel, but I just want to clarify my interpretation. In the GAP Report they had those two sections, so my assessment was based on what was there, just saying it needs to be reported. I didn't see anything saying where it had to be reported so I couldn't address that. And we have Corinna McMackin online. Corinna can you respond to that question? And we can restate it if necessary.

Corinna McMackin [00:39:08] This is Corinna, can you hear me?

Pete Hassemer [00:39:10] Yes, we can.

Corinna McMackin [00:39:12] I think Stephanie Johnson is also online and she generally covers Pacific whiting so I think she would be better to respond to this question. Stephanie, are you here?

Stephanie Johnson [00:39:25] Yes, I'm here. Can you guys hear me?

Pete Hassemer [00:39:29] Yes, we can.

Stephanie Johnson [00:39:32] Okay. The reg requires submission of the data, it does not require that it be made public.

Pete Hassemer [00:39:41] Okay, does that answer the question?

Corey Niles [00:39:44] Yeah, I think I may have misheard, but I thought someone suggested that the regulations were conflicting with the Magnuson Act but Miss Johnson just said no they're not. So thank you for the clarification.

Pete Hassemer [00:39:57] All right, thanks. Again, this is a difficult one because on this we're just looking at expectations, and it seems to be there was some confusion about what everyone's expectations were. I tried to summarize that, and maybe it's safest for me to look back to Mr. Todd Phillips and summarize again what he believes he heard in terms of the Council's expectations for this year's season. Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:40:45] Thank you. Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Again, I would say that we are looking at a largely improved communication between the sectors. They will share information as appropriate and they will continue to work forward on improving their relationships.

Pete Hassemer [00:41:12] All right. Any disagreement with that? Anything additional? Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:21] I'm good with all that, but all be managed to their set-aside, right? I think that's what they've been shooting for, for the day one, that's what they're doing and then everything else works perfectly, okay.

Pete Hassemer [00:41:30] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:41:47] We need to stop at some point, but there's just a difference in what stay within your set-aside means and.....

Brad Pettinger [00:41:53] Manage.

Corey Niles [00:41:53] Manage to you said, okay.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:57] Managed. Day one you're managing for your set-aside.

Corey Niles [00:41:59] And I don't want to.....I think it's, to me it just came to me after the break, it's what we are expecting is each sector in their best faith efforts to keep within their set-asides with the reasonable probability, something like that, so okay. I thought you....I misheard what you said.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:13] It's more than just communication, we still need to act, which Aja said she's going to do and her guys are going to do and I'm good at that. I mean when you get to that point communication happens and you tell them what you're doing and then sometimes you go over and, yeah, that's....

Pete Hassemer [00:42:40] And that's part of the communication. So we'll wrap this one up.

Aja Szumylo [00:43:00] Yeah, I still have to say sometimes we will go over. We will try hard, but yeah, yeah as long as that is....yes, okay. Brad, yes. But we will, yeah, work hard, communicate about actions that we take to avoid catch continuing at the pace that it's continuing at acknowledging that at times that we may go over the set-aside.

Pete Hassemer [00:43:28] Yes, and again, I'm going to step out to make sure we understand the catch reporting is online. Anybody can see that. Anybody can calculate a pro rata share if they so desire. Anybody can see progress towards that. Our expectation is there is communication occurring between the various sectors on those items. they're aware of what's happening. We're aware and there's communication and then Aja explained it, the communication that would occur should it be necessary and we anticipate that. So is that fair? Probably not but.... Todd do we need to do anything else here?

Todd Phillips [00:44:38] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Excuse me. No, I believe you have had a very robust discussion. I think you have achieved your actions as shown there on the screen, which is just consider necessary actions for implementing the 2025 Pacific whiting fishery. And of course, you had a vigorous discussion on expectations for the fishery this year. So I would say you've concluded your agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:45:04] All right, thank you. We'll wrap this up. There's no other hands raised here and I don't see any so thank you very much and we'll close out this agenda item

4. Final Assessment Methodologies

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our public comment, takes us to Council discussion and action here and that is to review and approve the SSC recommendations on the accepted practices and guidelines. So I will look for anybody to initiate discussion on this topic. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:00:31] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. A couple things. I think I'm going to have a few comments relative to ROV again, but I do have one process question if I can maybe call on Council staff? Is the accepted practices guideline only come about from subcommittee review and suggestions or can it also be amended at STAR Panels?

Marlene Bellman [00:00:59] Through the Vice-Chair, thank you for the question Council member McKnight. The accepted practices guidelines is taken up secondarily after the Terms of Reference. And they are recommendations initially through the Groundfish Subcommittee to the full SSC, and they are issues that have been raised and resolved and have gone through STAR Panel review. So that's sort of the process of how an issue gets resolved, raised, reviewed to the Groundfish Subcommittee, and those recommendations are made to this document and to the full SSC.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:35] Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:39] Thank you that answered my question. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:50] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:52] Thank you Vice-Chair. As I understand, we didn't need a motion for this one so I don't think any of us have prepared one. But just looking at the SSC Groundfish Subcommittee Report, it outlines a lot of issues to be looking at as they move forward with the STAR Panels. I know the Groundfish Subcommittee spent a lot of time on this and then the full SSC did review it, and I believe I just heard that they agreed with, sorry, they agreed with the best practices and they don't have any suggested substantive changes to the guidelines. With our Groundfish Subcommittee of the SSC and then the full SSC reviewing it, I think we're in a pretty good place. On the overall best practices, I think there's some continued dialogue about maybe ROV that we're going to have over the next few minutes. I don't know if that's the kind of guidance we're looking for or if it needs to be something more formal than that.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:01] Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:03:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss Mattes for teeing me up a little bit better there. Yeah, there isn't an action item here per se, it's just some discussion. As I mentioned under the CDF and W Report, we are appreciative of the continued conversation that's going on and the progressive work to integrate ROV indices into stock assessments. My question prior specifically about accepted practices and STAR review is that we have submitted or there has been exploration of ROV indices now in copper rockfish, and presumably upcoming in quillback. So I'm just making sure and being clear that we're not missing opportunities to incorporate this into documents such as accepted practices or TORs at the right time as appropriate, and in combination with what we're hearing is maybe some uncertainty about the future of STAR Panels and stock assessment work where we should be looking to make sure we're not missing

opportunities. So beyond that, I again appreciate all the work done by the subcommittee and SSC to work with CDF and W on advancing this work. And I'm very pleased to see that there is an endorsement for their general use at the discretion of STAT Teams. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:26] Okay, thank you. Other discussion here? And my notes here say there is no motion needed, it's just approve, consider and approve the report and the SSC's recommendations here. I'm seeing maybe a couple of hands, but Lynn Mattes you're most, I saw your hand go up.

Lynn Mattes [00:04:57] Thank you Vice-Chair. While what's in this document doesn't specifically address some of the things that the two gentlemen from Del Norte County were addressing, I think some of that work is going to continue on behind the scenes as we look into how to incorporate more of the CCFRP data, some of the citizen science data, incorporate new methodologies like the ROV data. I know that work continues. Our research folks, our stock assessors, many of us around this table are always trying to find ways to make sure we get the best data we can to inform those assessments. So I just want to acknowledge what we heard from those two gentlemen from Del Norte County. It may not look like anything is happening right now with the language that's in this practices guideline, but there is work being done to incorporate, to learn how to incorporate that type of information in the future.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:59] Thank you Lynn. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:06:04] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And appreciate the comments from CDFW, ODFW. I thought I heard Lynn earlier suggest we didn't need a motion, as you did, and was approving. I guess I would also approve. But going back to the end of the day yesterday and Mr. Burden bringing up the need to start to think about things differently, I kind of think what would happen if I did have a concern with these guidelines right now, you know, I would be told there's nothing you can do about it because the discussion already happened. And I should say I really appreciate John, Dr. John Field being here today and recognizing on a Saturday with all that's going on and all the work that Marlene I know put into this and corralling the SSC, all the good thought, but it's like again, if we had a concern I think they're there to answer our questions if we had them, but this isn't something where the process would allow for any kind of iteration or back and forth today. So just in the spirit of thinking about how we might do things differently, I think the staff cost and the personnel cost already was spent by the SSC and Marlene and others. So some cost, I guess but it's been awhile. There's items like this where there's limited input for the Council and just thinking out loud here, just brainstorming since we seem to have some time, but I don't want to make it sound like unappreciative of the work. And like Lynn makes a really good point that there are things happening everywhere that don't come out in our discussions because we're trying to get through the agenda here.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:57] Thank you Corey. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:08:01] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And Mr. Niles your comments, I guess, have me just reflecting on this document and how it came about and how it's used. And I think you raised some points. I think we should always be asking ourselves what, if anything, can we be doing better? I have no doubt that this document is a step in the direction of making things better. I mean it's a compilation of issues and practices and science that when stock assessment authors look at this it will help them be more efficient in putting together a stock assessment. But

sometimes there are reasons to look at things like this and say, is this the best approach? And so I think as most of you know we have been contemplating a project that would look at our stock assessment process. And that RFP, a draft of it, is in your briefing book under workload planning, and so you might think about that RFP and this document here as part of that process. And assuming we move forward with that project we would be asking ourselves is this document the best approach? Is our process the best approach? And so there will be a way to consider this and improvements on it. I would also maybe just characterize this, and this is my impression of how this is used, I would characterize it maybe in a different way than you did Mr. Niles, where, you know, these are guidelines and so if there's a STAT Team that's out there and they say, yeah we reviewed these guidelines, they look great but our opinion is different about some parameter. These aren't binding. I think the SSC would expect some rationale about why they would deviate from the guidelines, but there's, I don't view these as hamstringing any of the STAT Teams and doing something that's different. They're intended to be helpful in the way that I interpret them.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:12] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:10:14] Thanks for those thoughts Merrick. I guess, and yeah my points don't always come out as intended, but I wasn't suggesting that they wouldn't be, they're not binding, but like what is the Council's rule? I think the thing that caught my ear, and I'm not going to remember the words you actually used yesterday, but on the ecosystem matter you're like, can't the Science Centers just handle this themselves? So why cannot the stock assessors and the SSC handle this themselves? And the other point being if any of us had a comment up today, I guess the only time to change it would be probably whenever we do this again, probably two years from now, because there's no iteration in this. I think, and Marlene please tell me if I'm mistaken there, but this was.....came about through some winter meetings. And I do see the value of the scientists being transparent about what they plan on doing and be there to answer questions. And we've seen that happen this past few years with our assessment process of new folks coming in and not understanding. So there is a value to it but just again, kind of thinking out loud and there is really no Council input here, except for maybe some question, Q&A on better understanding why the guidelines are as they are. But, you know, getting repetitive. But yeah, if we wanted to suggest changes I just don't see there's opportunity today to do that.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:58] Thank you Corey. Other comments, discussion? Aside from the discussion I'm hearing, I've heard some approval of the SSC Report accepting that. Is there any disapproval? Or is this Council ready to accept that? Again, it's not a motion but I want to make sure everybody is on board agrees what, with what the SSC said? I'm seeing some head nods around the table. Rather than drag this out, Marlene what do we need to do?

Marlene Bellman [00:12:45] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Thank you for the thoughtful discussion and guidance to the SSC to move forward with their accepted practices guidelines for the coming stock assessment cycle.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:00] All right, thank you. I'll look around and see if there's any closing comments or discussion? Not seeing any, that completes this agenda item.

5. Cordell Bank Conservation Area Revisions – Final

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, that'll take care of public comment. I'm going to go to Council action. Oop, Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:07] Thank you Chair. I know you weren't used to looking to this side of the room for Cordell Bank, but I think this is the culmination of a lot of work by a lot of people to try to ease regulations, provide maybe a little more opportunity, a little less complexity. As the GMT said in their report, it's a deregulatory action, which I know a number of us are looking for with some guidance from the current administration, and should provide some more opportunities for anglers with low risk to habitat or some of our rebuilding species, acknowledging all of the work that's gone into this, taking this last step, and probably why there's been so few questions to our advisory body reports.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:53] Thank you Lynn. Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:01] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think if it's helpful I do have a motion that we could start and maybe get some more discussion going?

Brad Pettinger [00:01:13] Absolutely. Okay, please.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:14] I move the Council adopt the Preliminary Preferred Alternative, Alternative 1 from Agenda Item H.5, Attachment 1, March 2025 as the Final Preferred Alternative. And include the coordinates defining the hundred fathom depth contour around the bank in the regulations at 50.CFR.660.73 as recommended in Agenda Item H.5.a, NMFS Report 1, March 2025.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:45] All right. Is the language accurate on the screen?

Caroline McKnight [00:01:48] it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:49] Okay. second? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you. Please speak to your motion.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:52] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think I will start by thanking Council staff for the presentation and all the different advisory bodies for their contribution and comment on this item. I especially want to thank the Habitat Committee for spending some extra time updating the fishing gear impact information section and I would definitely support Council staff incorporating that information into the final analytical document as appropriate. I just want to acknowledge first that this motion reflects some very robust discussion stemming from our November Council discussion and this has really led to a culmination of some broad support from all of the advisory bodies we heard from today, including public comment. So I just want to reiterate that at the core of Alternative 1 here we have identified a very substantial issue of confusion and complexity where these differing conservation area regulations overlap. With these differing boundaries, as you saw in the staff report, it's making it not only difficult to follow the rules, but it's difficult to target groundfish in a reasonable manner out on the water without incurring unneeded regulatory discards. So the launch pad for this really did come about because

CDF and W is incurring a significant education and outreach cost to explain these rules to anglers in all sectors, which is difficult and confusing as they currently are. But beyond that, this alternative accomplishes something beyond just needing to make them more comprehensible and reducing the complexity. And first, I just want to acknowledge a major milestone, which is that after many years of constraining measures to rebuild groundfish species, and not quillback withstanding at the moment, there's no longer a need for the Cordell Bank Groundfish Conservation Area tool, and removing this regulation or deregulating is really a testament to the conservation bill being paid. The second is to recognize that there is a unique opportunity here to utilize a groundfish exclusion area, and that will strengthen the habitat protections along the core high relief portion of Cordell Bank, which we know is an area that holds unique and valuable ecological attributes. So I just want to touch quickly that there was mention in the staff report that the amount of real estate that's being reopened here for both rec and commercial respectively are fractional in terms of total EEZ access. I think the number was .014%, so this is really fractional. But a number of other factors have been identified that will continue to limit the accessibility of this area, which we've mentioned in prior CDF and W Reports, and that includes, you know this is not close to shore, this is hours and hours of run time to get there. So not only is it limiting by how far offshore it is, but we also have recreational season dates that are in place that would limit when you could be out there at all, and then you have the further compounding factor of weather conditions that can be variable and difficult to get out there. And while the commercial sector is limited by weather to some extent in different ways, the staff report showed that we generally have very low effort and performance from our commercial sectors anywhere near this area. The only new information really specific to this motion is for the trawling regulations that came about from the NMFS Report. I want to extend my gratitude to NMFS and Council staff in working with my staff, Andre Klein, to do a very thorough regulation check. We don't want to have any unintended consequences with this action and the suggestion to maintain that 100 fathom depth contour in the regs in the appropriate place to maintain only small foot rope gear is a hundred percent in line with our intent and would probably create more problems if we didn't, and it wouldn't make sense. So again we want to express our gratitude for making these changes in a synergistic way. Again, I just want to extend my gratitude to all of the input and perspectives that we've received on this action, including our input from our national, excuse me, Office of National Marine Sanctuary staff, other NGO representatives, and industry and public comment. And thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:20] All right, thank you Caroline. Questions for the motion maker? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:06:29] Thanks Chair. Thanks, Miss McKnight, for this motion. Just a question, if your intention was to include the text and references to be added as recommended in the Habitat Committee Report?

Caroline McKnight [00:06:45] Thank you for the question Miss Ridings. Yes, at the beginning of my....when I started I said I would be supportive of that being included. I don't know if that needs to be in the motion per se, but it is the intent to include that as needed. But I'd maybe defer to Council staff if they want to clarify.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:59] Jessi.

Jessi Waller [00:07:03] Thank you Mr. Chair, Miss McKnight, no, I would take that. I think we would plan on incorporating those edits.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:10] Corey, good? All right. No more questions. Discussion of the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:07:24] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And thanks to CDFW and staff and everyone who put this together. And yeah, thanks Corey for mentioning the Habitat Committee. I feel like this is not our corner of the coast here in Washington, but I feel like you all in California took a close look and looked at the best available science, and yeah there could be impacts. I hear you saying that we're opening some fishing grounds, but not a lot of people might use it. What you said about the Conservation Bill I think is what our duty under the Magnuson Act is of once you rebuild the stocks you're supposed to share the recovery benefits. And just one comment I couldn't resist, yeah there's been papers out coming about the percentage of the EEZ protected, but I think this is a good example of like in.....Butch here will remind us that not every inch of the ocean is equal and there's not halibut grounds all over the place, off of Ilwaco for example, and Cordell Bank is maybe .147 of the EEZ but it's got a lot more biology going on there. So in the future, I don't know if that's as meaningful of a metric. It could be nuanced is all I'll say. But bigger comment there, thank you for all the hard work and the close look at the trade-offs here, and supportive of course.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:51] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Okay, well seeing none I'll call for the question so. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:09:06] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:07] Opposed no? Abstentions? Rebecca you have a...

Rebecca Lent [00:09:16] Thank you Chair, just a follow-up question for NMFS. Since this is a good news deregulatory measure, I assume it's to sail through OMB and be published tomorrow? Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:32] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:09:32] Through the Chair, no comment.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:35] All right, well we can't always give people what they want but it's nice to be able to give something back and have a little more opportunity so it's good stuff. All right.

6. Phase 2 Stock Definitions

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, that concludes public comment and which takes us to Council action, which is going to be on the screen here shortly. So I'll open the floor up for discussion. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:00:16] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I have a question that maybe is to Keeley and I'm thinking about this in terms of the range of alternatives overall. So for moving a lot of the discussion, or as part of the discussion that Todd gave earlier, there was some reference to the potential for changing this decision later. So say we move something out of the FMP and need to bring it back in, and I'll say this as a process question more than anything else, but right now is an amendment required to move, to ultimately move a stock back into the FMP later on?

Brad Pettinger [00:00:59] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:00:59] Thanks for the question. Yes, we definitely as part of this process are clarifying that the Council needs to define all stocks in need of conservation and management in the FMP. So we are doing that holistic process now and then in the future if something changes we would go through an FMP amendment process to change either a stock boundary or, you know, whether you're adding something in new. So that is an FMP amendment process that we would go through. And I think that there's some contemplation in the COP that has already been changed relative to stock definitions of what that process looks like, so we have had discussion on that previously.

Aja Szumylo [00:01:43] Thank you for that Keeley. Yeah I'm thinking about my time in New England and their use of framework adjustments. So in that situation where there's a regulatory structure that they build that shortens the, or constrains the Council process a little bit around making decisions that we've already discussed thoroughly elsewhere in the Council process. I'm thinking about this particular to the range of alternatives if there's a way to also add in an alternative where we could foreshorten the process of moving things in and out. And so, yeah, I don't have a specific idea yet, but since we're talking about the range I wanted to consider if this is a place to build in some kind of consideration around process to make this simpler now that we've done this very thorough, tortured look to never have to do it with this length and intensity again.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:39] Okay, thanks Aja. And Keeley you had your hand up I believe. Was that for to speak?

Keeley Kent [00:02:46] I did want to make some other remarks, but if I can follow-up on Aja's last remark as well.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:52] Please.

Keeley Kent [00:02:53] We...an FMP amendment process is the appropriate vehicle in this particular type of issue. The process that we're going through right now is holistic and we're looking at a lot of species and addressing things and issues that have been around and unresolved for 20, 30 years. So that, I want to set that aside and say that doesn't have to be how these questions are dealt with in the future, but we strongly feel that an FMP amendment process is what needs to happen for the Council to make changes in the stocks that it manages. It does not have to be hard.

It doesn't have to be long. If there's a particular species that changes at some point in the future, we could do that in a reasonable way. I think we wouldn't necessarily drive what the Council process has to look like, that is certainly a question for Council staff. And like I mentioned, I think the COP that was revised just in the last year or two really already contemplated that, but from the regulatory action pathway, an FMP amendment is appropriate and it does not have to be torturous, and it could happen in a reasonable amount of time if that helps. I do want to make some other remarks, but maybe I'll just pause to see if there was any reaction back to that from Aja.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:22] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:04:22] Thank you. And thank you Keeley for that answer, that helps a lot. And I guess I do have a question to Council staff. I was not around for the adjustments in the COPs to address this process, and I'm curious if, yeah, this might be an opportunity to add in a pathway to foreshorten like a very lengthy Council process on top of this? I see exactly what you're saying, Keeley, about it needing to be an FMP amendment every time, so that makes sense and I guess is helpful for everybody else to keep in mind going forward that, yeah, if we make this decision now, it requires a full amendment to get it back in, but yeah does it....yeah what is the Council process side of it?

Todd Phillips [00:05:08] Yes, through the Chair, thank you Miss Aja for that question. So the process at this particular juncture, so I might backup, under Amendment 31 when we first began the stock definitions process, we added some language within sort of the groundfish schedule, so this is in general considered the biennial schedule. We added a clause or a statement in there that says that the opportunity can be, the opportunity to reevaluate any given stock's definition should or could occur in concert with the assessment process. If the Council wants further clarity on your discussion, we can definitely bring back some sort of language that would make it very, I don't know specific, but I guess give enough leeway for the Council to move fast on something like this.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:05] All right, thank you. Keeley, did you have more?

Keeley Kent [00:06:10] Yes, I wanted to just make some general remarks as the Council gets under discussion here. I wanted to recognize the very thorough reports that we received at this Council meeting. I had the opportunity to sit in on a lot of those discussions in the SSC and the GMT and the GAP, and I was really appreciative of the care and thoughtfulness that each of those groups has given to this action. I will, you know, reiterate some of my comments from the last time we talked about this in September that I recognize that this is a really challenging action to look at. There's a lot of moving parts here. There's a lot of complexities. And as I've already mentioned, there are a lot of issues that have been percolating around the Council for the past 20, 30 years, ones that you've looked at before and had a challenging time trying to figure out how to address. So this is hard. I want to recognize that there's been a lot of good conversations. There's been an incredible amount of work thus far, not done yet certainly, but a lot of work thus far by the action team, by Todd, and from my staff, Abbie, and we have a long way to go but I am really pleased with where we're at and I'm really appreciative of the hard look that everyone is giving to this. You know I want to reiterate sort of a couple of points, which is just that this is a really important agenda item for the agency. It's very important that we have the hard look at what the Council is doing in groundfish and going through the exercise of ensuring that we are only managing things that are within our authority, that we can only do what the law provides us, and that this hard look is giving us a really good sense of that. I would also note that from our

perspective process-wise we would expect that we're going to need two more bites at the apple, and I think we'll get into that but I think I want to set that up just for folks that my expectation is that we're going to talk about this in June and then potentially in September or a later meeting. I'm happy to hear from Council staff on that, but I do think we need two more bites at the apple. And the reason I raise that now is because I'm hoping that that gives folks around the table the sense that you still have time to consider these. And so I don't want anybody to feel rushed in this. I'm not trying to drag it out, but I think these comprehensive looks, right, we need to make sure that everyone is understanding what has been brought forward, and so I think we can get there in two more bites. I'm certainly happy to hear from Council staff leadership on whether they support that. But that leads us into the expectation that there's a lot of work to be done between March and June. I think we can help bring forward the next round of the package that will lay a lot of things out and I'm hopeful that we can continue to think outside of the box. You know I raised on the SSC question about the fact that I think there's more to explore on EC species and the way that they are dealt with in our FMP. And I see some of the concerns about species that may never be able to be targeted again but that currently we have prohibitions on retention of and that's something we could explore, whether that's something that would be appropriate for an EC species. And so I would encourage the Council not to get stuck at this point based on the things that we have done before as limiting what we could do as we go forward. And I think that's something that we would commit to working with Council staff between now and the next meeting to try to flesh out further if the Council would like that exploration. So thank you for the moment to give some opening remarks, I really appreciate it.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:53] Okay, thank you Keeley. Very good. Okay, Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:09:59] Thank you Chair. And my question may be somewhat for Miss Kent and either Mr. Phillips or Executive Director Burden is, you know, throughout this meeting we've been talking about workload and capacity issues and unfortunately I think things are going to change again at the end of this next week, there's likely changes. Where does this fall in the current priorities of things that are in the hopper for work on? I thought I heard earlier in the week that maybe we didn't, we might not have this in June. Are we making enough progress on this that if it slowed down or other things got prioritized? I think it would just be helpful to have a little bit of that discussion about where this falls with workload and our limited resources compared to other things we have going on.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:52] Let's go to Keeley first. Keeley?

Keeley Kent [00:10:56] Thanks for the question Miss Mattes. For the West Coast Region, in particular the Groundfish Branch, this action is our highest priority. The reason being is that it has a mix of things. One is that we have already identified to the Council that there are a number of the issues that we are chipping away at in this action where we've identified that this fishery is not, is not consistent with the MSA and the NS1 regulations. We need to resolve that. We need to keep chipping away at that and make progress on that, so that is part of why it continues to be a high priority. I'll also note that it is a high priority for us because we think ultimately at the end of the day that these changes to the FMP would be deregulatory. That looking at some of these species, making the determination that they are not in need of conservation and management, either they are moved out of the FMP or they are determined to be EC species, later on in the process we're going to look at the question of delegating management authority to the states. All of these things are deregulatory, which will certainly benefit us in the current situation as well as have the potential

to reduce the amount of resources needed to better match what you have already heard from the resource limitations from the center about assessments and things like that. So I think even though when we started all of this process, all of those factors that I just listed through weren't necessarily on the table. It's become an action that is, it is good that it is already in progress because it's able to meet a lot of emerging needs in addition to the original needs that we identified that we started on this. So we will continue to prioritize our work on this action over other actions. Certainly as we get into the next spex process that would be sort of the other driver, but in terms of other actions that are going on, we will continue to have this be our top. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:02] All right, thank you Keeley. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:06] Thank you Mr. Chairman, and appreciate your question Miss Mattes about capacity. We are currently planning our staffing in a way that contemplates working on this through September. So the way we have outlined it in our planning is potentially taking final on some species in June and then the rest of the final in September, and right now our workload contemplates that setup. Of course we don't know what we don't know so if something major happens we might have to reevaluate it, but that is, right now that is one of our core groundfish priorities. In terms of other priorities, I would just encourage us to think about that on our day last.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:56] Okay. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:13:58] Yeah I just had some opening thoughts, but if there are other questions for Keeley I can hold off on those.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:05] I'm not seeing any hands so Keeley has her hand down so I think you're up.

Corey Niles [00:14:11] Thanks Mr. Chair. I'm not sure where to start here. I guess I think I'm going to say that WDFW is pretty frustrated that we're doing this at all. This is not the best use of the Council's time and maybe we'll get that to the later in the workload planning item. We do have to pay attention to law and to jurisdiction, but what we're here to achieve is conservation and sustainable fisheries. That is a matter of biology and science. So like when we talk about deregulating we need to be mindful, even if we can't do anything about it, of what the consequences on biology and our fishing communities will be and that should be our guiding principles. And I'll point to National Standard 3, which I think the Magnuson Act is very, is a law that's very, very grounded in science and economics and it reminds us that we should, you know to the extent practicable, manage basically the stocks of fish as a unit throughout the range and interrelated stocks of fish will be managed as a unit or close coordination. That's core population biology. Population biology 101. So also, and Miss Kent mentioned that this is a priority, again, I'm not seeing why, the one thing that's pretty clear in the Magnuson Act, except in very extremely limited cases, the Councils don't have regulatory authority in state waters. And at least in WDFW's case, we recognize that for a long time and we're not asking the Council to regulate in state waters. For us the only fishery where we really is relevant is our recreational fishery. We don't have commercial groundfish fisheries in state waters so we have been using state authority to manage that fishery consistent with the federal FMP by discretion through state authority. So we don't see, for us we're not seeing any kind of meaningful lack of compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act. What we do stand to lose I think is, and Ben in his testimony said it, if this is working, this works well in where what we're doing is collaboratively managing. And I think others have

mentioned that the states, what we really lack with the resources, also limited resource we have is, is the stock assessment capacity. And if that's what we're looking to lose here to lose, give less attention to the stocks that are more in state waters, that's what we're really concerned about. And I think because of what others have said about the analysis and all the effort that we don't want to make it sound like we don't think this, that people who are working hard doing good work, but it's a question of is this really the best, the best use of our time? And I'll....and I'm not saying we should stop, we'll see what motions come. But the last thing I'll say for now is that the National Standard Guidelines, they do under the optimum yield sections has a section called, it's called state federal ACLs or something like that, and it says, I'll just read one more sentence, "When stocks are co-managed by federal, state, tribal, and or territorial fishery managers, the goal should be to develop collaborative conservation and management strategies and scientific capacity to support such strategies, including accountability measures for state or territorial and federal waters to prevent overfishing of shared stocks and ensure their sustainability", and that should be our goal here and not get too focused on jurisdiction. I think we've all, a lot of us have been frustrated that we kind of ignore that petrale sole live just across the border in Canada and add 10 more, 100 more stocks that the same is true. And just how we got here to this current effort is we had the stock assessment come out for quillback rockfish in California, and it was on that unit of that stock it looked like it was overfished by our policies, and we recommended it based on our conservation policies that we should go into rebuilding, and then NMFS came back and said, well California quillback isn't in your FMP, only coastwide quillback is. And so again, was that really a conservation reason or was that something different? And yeah I can't miss my opportunity to say that I don't think that the California quillback stock goes from B 12 percent to B 40 percent as soon as you hit the California-Oregon border. There's biology at play and connectivity and so yeah I just really hope.....yeah we have to pay attention to the rule of law. I hope we continue to pay attention to the rule of law and that I hope we keep our eye on that, our idea on that goal that's in the National Standard 1 Guidelines of this collaborative state, federal management, and tribal management of our shared stocks.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:07] Thanks Corey. David Sones.

David Sones [00:20:08] Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to confirm that the staff has been working with the tribes on this issue, and one of the concerns is I keep hearing there's no commercial fishery in Washington in the three miles. We do have regulations where we have China rock, green kelping and black sea bass and interest has come and gone on live fish fishing and those were probably going to take place inside of three miles. I know Washington doesn't allow that but the tribes have had some interest in that, so I wanted to make sure that got out that there's concern if we're not looking at some of those stocks that they, and what impacts those fisheries may have? But that was a question for Todd.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:01] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:21:01] Yes, through the Chair, thank you Mr. Sones. We have had discussions, I'm sure Miss Kent will have some discussion about this as well, but we have, I have discussed Phase 2 with the tribes and we are still in that particular phase. We only looked at non-tribal commercial data mostly in respect to the nation's because they, it is the or data. In those discussions with the tribes there was some understanding of their data that they needed to go through and there was not, they have not yet, I guess come to a consensus of how to present that information.

David Sones [00:21:44] Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:44] Thanks Todd. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:21:44] Thanks Mr. Chair. That's what I hope Dave. I don't know that you meant it, but when I said commercial fisheries I was only referring to the non-tribal. I didn't mean to suggest that we didn't recognize that the Makah and the tribes are able to fish what we might think of a commercial fishery in state water, so apologies for that oversight if I made it.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:06] All right, all good. All right, discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:22:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think I'll jump into some meat here and share some comments relative to our Task Number 1. I just want to say thank you to Mr. Phillips and the NMFS staff and the analytical team that have contributed to this. You've been asked to land a 757 on a sidewalk and that's really difficult when we've got coastwide depth, geographic, population range differences across Mexico and Canada. This is a really difficult needle to thread. So relative to the 25% after listening to the staff presentation, I feel that's an appropriate approach given the circumstances and noting that the precision is not going to be perfect for every species. Nevertheless, I think that the list that the GMT has put forward as Alternative 1 seems appropriate and reasonable to me as does the 38 additional species for further analysis. I guess one question I have relative back to the workload question is, is that 38 species, which are noted by the GAP for three options, does that kind of a workload still seem reasonable for the timeline mentioned noting that three options is a lot for 38 species? Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:41] Thank you Caroline.

Todd Phillips [00:23:46] Yes, through the Chair. Before I answer your question Miss McKnight, I see that Miss Kent's hand went up I believe. Was that true?

Brad Pettinger [00:23:53] It did.

Todd Phillips [00:23:54] Okay, let's, if I may defer to her first.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:57] Keeley was, do you want to answer that or?

Keeley Kent [00:24:02] Sure, I'm sure Mr. Phillips and I would have had the same answer, which is that, you know, at this stage the analysis of different alternatives, when we're talking about Alternatives 2 and 3, is really the same. We're going through the 10-factor analysis regardless and then we'll use that information to help us inform an action team recommendation that we would bring to the Council about what that 10-factor analysis tells us and what that may mean for whether that species is a good candidate for Alt 1, 2, or 3. So in that way I think the analysis is simpler. I will also say that we've had initial discussions and I'm expecting to have further discussions about the possibilities of binning. Again, back in September we talked about binning, but we think that there's opportunities because of some of the similarities of these species that we could consider them together through the 10-factor analysis. So we will be looking for those opportunities to take things together for efficiency purposes when it is appropriate based on the species. So I think all of that together, right? I can't give you the specifics right now, but we are already talking about that and we'll look for those opportunities to help us proceed on a timely way between now and the next time you'll see this.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:18] Okay, thanks Keeley. And Keeley you had your hand up prior to Caroline being called, so did you have anything else you wanted to say?

Keeley Kent [00:25:26] Yes, I wanted to come back to some of Mr. Niles's comments. You know I hear the points raised and I just would remind him, I think, you know we are restricted based on what the law allows us to do, so in this way, right, we have to follow the jurisdiction that is provided to us, to NMFS, and to the Council under the MSA, and it's within those confines that we are evaluating the scientific information. Separately there's certainly conversations to be had about the collaborative nature between federal, state, and interstate commission entities about management, but that doesn't change the authority piece, which is absolutely laid out in the MSA. And so I don't disagree with the comments about the need to coordinate and to communicate, but I think what we're looking at here, and this tacks back to some of Director Burden's comments earlier on, is where is there a meaningful level of control that the Council and NMFS has over the trajectory, the health of these stocks? And that is the question we're getting at. It doesn't negate the other questions about coordination and using resources across these different political entities, but what we're asking is that very fundamental question. And I do think we have to go through that, and the Council's been grappling with this for a while. You've gone through it before and so I don't think it's....that is why we think it is a priority so I just wanted to tack back to that. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:56] Okay, thank you Keeley. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:27:00] Thank you Keeley. I always appreciate and impressed how closely you listen and are able to respond so I, and I thank you. I think we're looking forward to having those questions about how we coordinate achieving those goals of for conservation and sustained participation of our fishing communities. And I guess I'll just lead into the other comment on this 25% threshold. Typically like the Oregon-California border example thresholds, I'm always skeptical that there's a black and white break. So I think, just my thought is if we're going to go through that 10-factor analysis it should be not black....25, you know, 25.1 yes, 24.9 no. It should be what I think if we're going to, as Merrick was articulating, if it is and what you said Keeley, too, I think is another way of saying what is the degree of control that federal regulations have over the fishery. I think that would be the focus more than a black and white threshold. I'm really good at coming up with unrealistic hypotheticals today, but for example, what if, and I think the unit should be our fisheries and our sectors, and here's my, what if is a sector, for example, that fishes in both state and federal waters yet there's a state water only species where the revenue for that species is necessary for the profitability of the fishery? I think without that species that fishery could not happen and the state bans harvest on that fish or just overfishes it so it's no longer there, the federal fishery goes away. So that's just maybe unrealistic, but it would be the importance of the revenue for a commercial fishery and being analog to the recreational fisheries, I'm sure. But I think that would be how I would think through it rather than looking for a black and white numeric threshold.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:23] Thanks Corey. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:29:25] Thank you Mr. Chair. If I may, I appreciated Miss Kent's response to my question, but I wanted to verify whether or not Mr. Phillips had a response as well.

Todd Phillips [00:29:37] Through the Chair, thank you for the question Miss McKnight. As Miss Kent indicated, the 305(c) analysis really for both species is, I don't want to say it's the same, but it's pretty much the same. It is 38 species plus defining the other ones. It is a fair amount of work. I would hope that if things don't take a turn for the worst with the, with what may happen with budgets and that sort of thing and the ability of NMFS to provide support, I would look to Merrick, Mr. Burden, regarding staffing on our side of things, but yeah it is, to be honest it is, it could be a lot of work.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:31] Okay, good Caroline? Good? All right. Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:30:37] Thanks. I wanted to come back to Mr. Nile's most recent points and just reiterate that through this process the 10-factor analysis would get into exactly what you're raising, which is that we are using the 25% threshold right now as an initial cut, which I think Mr. Phillips did an excellent job of explaining. What will come out then in the 10-factor analysis is things like you raised, you know the economic importance of a particular species to coastal economies, the ecological importance, right? And that, by doing that 10-factor analysis you'll get a full picture that will allow the weighting and so it, we don't view the end point of a potential decision to either remove a stock or to change it into an EC species as, as just being driven by 25%. So I agree with what you're saying there. I will also say though, right, we use thresholds across our management scheme. With when you're looking at a status determination, a hair above 25% means that you are not overfished and a hair below means that you are overfished and you need to go through a rebuilding plan. So there's certainly a conversation there, but I would just say it's not unusual that we often have to draw these lines in the sand to be able to go through our work, but how we view the next stage of this analysis is allowing an opportunity to get into the meat of what may be missing from that initial cut. What else do we need to consider? You know how else, you know where is the uncertainty around that particular species spatial distribution relative to 25%? And so that's the hope that we're making an initial cut that will help with workload but give us the opportunity to dig in on the species where we really want to know more than just this one piece of information about their potential spatial structure.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:47] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:32:53] Thank you Keeley. If you were here I would nod appreciatively for that response, but since you're not I just thank you again. That was helpful. In many of my statements here I'm actually just confused or not seeing clearly what happens next, so that was helpful.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:09] All right, thanks Corey. This is the part where I look for someone with a motion I think maybe since I don't see any hands so.... Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:33:21] Thank you Chair. I was just kind of waiting for some of the discussion to take place. I do agree with a number of the points Mr. Niles has made about why are we taking this up. Why, how does this directly benefit our fisheries, our fishing communities, conservation is uncertain? Regardless of those thoughts we're here and we have to move forward. I do have some motions ready. Keeley used multiple bites of the apple. I use a different metaphor. I have a cartoon sitting next to my desk that says how do you eat an elephant? Take it one bite at a time. So I have three bites at the elephant broken out to try to be strategic in how we move forward. And when we're ready the tower of power does have those motions to try to move us forward with what we are being requested to do today.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:27] Maybe we just want to take a pause here. We've been at it for about an hour and a half. We have three, four motions to happen, probably some discussion. Three? So can we just take a quick break so we just finish it off so we're not all kind of crossing our legs. So let's do that, let's take, let's do five minutes, six.....(BREAK).....All right we are now back in session on H.6, and I believe we had some motions forthcoming so unless there's any more discussion? I'm not seeing any hands for discussion so we'll look for motion hands. Ah, Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:35:22] Thank you. I'm not sure if we're starting at the trunk of the tail of the elephant, but here's our first bite as evidently we love metaphors this morning. ODFW Motion 1. I move the Council adopt the 25% threshold framework for identifying species principally caught in federal waters for this process as outlined in Attachment H.6, Supplemental Revised Attachment 1, March 2025, and the range of alternatives as outlined in the same document and summarized below. No Action. Alternative 1: Identify species in need of conservation and management which will be defined as one or more stocks and will remain in the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan, or FMP. Alternative 2: Identify species as not in need of conservation and management that could be removed from the Groundfish FMP. And Alternative 3: Identify species as ecosystem or EC species for which stocks will not be defined, though the species will remain in the FMP.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:30] All right, thank you Lynn. Is the language on the screen accurate?

Lynn Mattes [00:36:32] It appears so. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:34] Very good. Looking for a second? Seconded by Aja Szumylo. All right, please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:36:40] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I think the GMT did a good job to describe the 25% threshold and some of the concerns and we've had some discussion about it. It is trying to be precautionary for changes in our fishery, changes in our environment. I also took a brief look at, a real high-level look at some of the data and there was a bit of a break point between 25 and 29%. Was it exactly 25 and not 25.1 I don't know. I couldn't get that fine, but there was a bit of a break point there, so it seems like there is some data needs, some data reasons there. And again, this is for this action only where you're not setting precedent with 25% as primarily caught in federal waters, but it's a starting point that we as we go through this process, as we continue to eat the elephant or bite at the apple, we might find a different threshold that works better, but it was a starting point. And then I believe the range of alternatives for what we do with the individual species is consistent with what the GAP and the GMT and the SSC recommended, therefore I don't have any other comments on this piece of it.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:56] All right, thank you Lynn. Questions for the motion maker? Or questions of the motion? Discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:38:09] Yeah, thanks Lynn for the motion. Just briefly, I think, yeah I will support it, you know, based on the discussion and what Miss Kent said about this being a start and, as Lynn spoke to, further analysis will look closer and I just, yeah, I think having this discussion today I think rather than the mortality, it would have been some measure of what's the importance to the fishery. For example, you can have pretty low catches, as we've seen of certain species that really

have a bigger outsized effect on the fishery. But for now, I think is, it sounds, it's a reasonable next step. So thank you Lynn for the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:38:50] All right, thank you Corey. Anyone else? fairly cut and dried here so all right I don't see any hands so I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:39:06] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:39:08] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. All right. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:39:19] All righty. Thank you Chair. Moving up the trunk of the elephant I have ODFW Motion 2. And I'm going to just belabor that metaphor today evidently. This motion does have two tables that we're going to be looking at just as a heads-up. So ODFW Motion 2. I move for the Council adopt as PPA maintaining the following species with already defined stocks in the groundfish FMP. And I'm not sure, do I need to read all of those species on that table or reference the table?

Brad Pettinger [00:39:56] Let's reference.

Lynn Mattes [00:39:58] Okay. Then....and I move to maintain the following species in the groundfish FMP with the range of alternatives as for stocks as shown in the table below with the PPA stock definition bolded. To use arrowtooth flounder as an example, there is the range of alternatives is just one stock, and the PPA for stock delineation would be coastwide. And then this table has approximately 20 species in it as well. Most are coastwide. I think I'll call out the ones that are not coastwide. For California scorpionfish, it could be coastwide or California-only. PPA is California-only. Same thing with cowcod, California-only. darkblotched rockfish, there was in the SSC Report potential for multiple stocks, recommending coastwide. Moving down to harlequin rockfish, Oregon and Washington. And then the majority of the rest until we get down to starry rockfish are coastwide and starry rockfish recommending coast, California-only. And yes it appears to be correct, the table and the text.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:33] Okay. Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:41:36] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. A question for you Miss Mattes regarding this particular motion. I don't know if Kris or Hayden are scrolling, but could you scroll back up on this particular table to bocaccio? Yes, right there. So Miss Mattes you noted that if it was in bolden, it was the PPA and it seems like both categories are in bolden, is there.....?

Lynn Mattes [00:42:05] Through the Chair, Mr. Phillips, that was a very early morning change in decision. It should be Column 1 bolded. Column 2 should be unbolded so that it's only coastwide. thank you for catching my early morning mistake.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:27] Okay. Thank you Todd. All right. So with that do we....is the language on the screen accurate?

Lynn Mattes [00:42:36] Yes sir, I believe it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:37] Okay, very good. Looking for a second by Corey Niles. All right, please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:42:46] Thank you Chair. The first table, those are species we've already gone through the stock definition process. They're just species that were assessed last cycle or are in the process of the cycle being assessed, and I believe were recommended also by the, in the analytical document as well as the GMT. Then the species in the remainder of the table, that is based on a combination of GMT and SSC recommendations. I do want to note that I added that second recommendation for bocaccio rockfish. It's for some reason the table of the spex database table popped in my head where bocaccio rockfish is a standalone species south of 40°10', but it is part of the either shelf or slope complex north of 40°10'. Therefore, I wanted just to have it as a range of alternatives that north of 40°10' and south of 40°10'. I know there was some discussion about species with maybe limited range, such as starry rockfish that is showing on the screen right now, maybe keeping those as coastwide. However, I don't think the range is within several hundred miles of the Oregon-California border for that species, so at the time making it California-only seems to make sense because I don't know that we want to as part of spex get into a battle or a discussion of how much starry rockfish ACL contribution should Washington and Oregon get for a species that doesn't occur into Washington and Oregon. So that was the thinking behind splitting it out. Similarly harlequin rockfish, it does not appear to occur south of, I don't know that it occurs much into Oregon, I think it does some, but don't think it occurs into California, so having an allocation or needing to track that in California doesn't seem appropriate. Similarly with cowcod and California scorpionfish, those are stocks that don't really occur into Oregon and Washington, therefore it seems to be cleaner to limit their range or their delineation to California-only. So hopefully that works for a discussion on the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:45:12] Very good. So all right, questions for the motion maker? Discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you Miss Mattes for the motion. I'll be supporting it. I just wanted to speak just for a moment to the distinction in adding some area specifics for the stock definitions that are, I think, very reasonable. We wouldn't necessarily want to say that California scorpionfish is anywhere other than California. The only one that caught my eye that made me pause just a bit, and I made a comment on this during the SSC Report, is greenspotted being listed as coastwide or north and south of Point Conception, and that seems relatively limited. I think if I'm understanding where we're at in process right now, if the SSC comes back in June or whenever we talk about this again and they feel differently and they want to just call it California, I think we can still do that. Or is it one or the other? That's my only sort of question point relative to these two tables. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:54] Okay.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:54] I'm not sure if that's a question for myself or Mr. Phillips, but I'll take the first crack at it. I believe we can make changes between PPA and FPA if we get new information. I did not know enough about that species and was too tired just to go looking up information on it, but I believe if there is something like that we could make a change. The FPA could be different than the PPA, but maybe Mr. Phillips can confirm that. I see his head nodding.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:24] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:01:25] Yes, through the Chair, thank you Miss Mattes and Miss McKnight for that question. Miss Mattes is absolutely correct, we can go back and revise these. Since I've lived with stock definition so long, you probably don't recall, but squarespot rockfish was under the same type of, I guess, consideration where we laid out an Option 1 for that particular stock but also had as California and coastwide both as single stock options. So in the analysis I'll just bring that forward for further review. But yes, you can change.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:56] Okay, thank you Todd. All right, anyone else? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:02:04] Well, not a question, but just supporting the motion, but this discussion makes me think that the better... I don't think we should put too much stock into what were these definitions now. I think it's really when the stock is assessed or when you are allocating things we should worry about it in the future. But bocaccio, for example, I did listen to the SSCs discussion on my drive down here and was reminded that there's a population center kind of off of California, Southern California, and then it doesn't like Oregon, there's a gap, and then there's a population center off of Vancouver Island which dips down into Washington. Is that one population or is it two? And if your memory serves, the Canadians knocked that one down to something less than B 10 percent. So I would support this, but I don't think we're having the thorough discussions we would have when a stock is up for assessment, But just kind of a point of emphasis for the future.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:07] Thank you Corey. All right. Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:03:16] Thanks. On that last point, I think there's probably a nuance in that and I will tack back again to the COP about redefining stocks, which does contemplate that new information can be brought forward in the stock assessment process, but re-grounding us in that we are trying to change the order of operations that we need to have stocks defined first, and then we have assessments for those defined stocks. So I think the nuance is that we know that we could get new information in the future that would suggest a change and that oftentimes we aren't looking at these questions until and unless there's a stock assessment, but we do need to define them with their areas before we seek to assess them and make sure that we are not having these decisions be in a post hoc manner.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:10] Thank you Keeley. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:04:10] I don't think I agree with that at all, but so I would like to amend the motion and if you could scroll, I don't know how to amend the table to get a, if we're having a thorough discussion now, which I don't see what the point is of deciding, having a....asking a really thorough discussion of bocaccio until we actually do the assessment. But I guess I will just leave it for the next round and like Lynn said we could change it at the next stage. But I don't, that doesn't, what Miss Kent said there is not....I wasn't comfortable with what she said but I think I can support that today and we can think about it for the next time this comes up.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:04] Okay. Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:05:04] Yep, and I apologize if I confused you Mr. Niles. What I meant was sort of when we finish this full process, but I agree with Miss Mattes that we, I forget which bite of the

elephant we are taking today, but we do have time. This is not FPA for these stock definitions on Alt 1 yet. What we would add the opportunity is for more analysis, but by the end of this entire agenda item, Phase 2, potentially in September, we do want to have defined stocks. We have a process then where if new information in an assessment comes forward suggesting different stock boundaries that we could address it then. So I will hopefully strike the middle ground on that and apologies for adding more confusion if I did.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:53] All right, thank you Keeley. Okay, any more discussion? Okay, I'm not seeing any so I'm going to call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:06:06] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:09] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. All right, thank you. And then Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:18] Thank you Chair. I've got one more motion on this to try to address the rest of our lunch with on the elephant today. So ODFW Motion 3. I move the Council advance the following species forward for evaluation consistent with the full range of alternatives outlined in Agenda Item H.6, Supplemental Revised Attachment 1, March 2025, and request the analytical team bring back additional information to support choosing a PPA for those species at a later date. And then there's a list of the 38 species that were in the GMT Report.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:09] Okay. Very good. All right. So was the language on the screen accurate?

Lynn Mattes [00:07:10] Yes sir, it appears to be.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:12] Very good. Thank you. Looking for a second? Seconded by Aja Szumylo. Thank you Aja. Okay, please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:23] Thank you Chair. I was just enjoying the spelling of my last name, but I appreciate all the work Hayden and Kris do. So this is largely following the GMT's recommendation. Initially I was going with, I was going to go with just what was in the table, the B species in the analytical document, but the GMT, and the SSC as well, laid out some compelling arguments, and based on what I read in their reports and some discussion with my other state counterparts, felt it was appropriate to add the species that the GMT recommended to this list. And I apologize to Mr. Phillips and his NMFS counterparts who are going to have to do some extra work, but I do think we need to take a look at some of these other species. It wasn't as clean, clear-cut in my mind that we were ready to take action and make a PPA on something like rosy rockfish or pygmy rockfish. I think we need some more information on those. And again, I really appreciate the way the GMT and the SSC outlined their thoughts to help.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:42] All right, thanks Lynn. Okay, questions for the motion maker? Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:08:49] Thank you Chair, and thank you Lynn for the motion. My question is what is the nature of the analysis you expect to be done offline before it comes back to the Council?

Lynn Mattes [00:09:00] Through the Chair, Mr. Gorelnik, this is those 10 factors that we were talking about earlier, 660.305 something or another, where we go through those 10 things that Keeley has pointed out and discussed several times, look at those to try to help determine does it stay in the FMP? Does it get delegated to the states? Is it an EC species? And through that process we may have some more information to determine does it one stock, two stocks, three stocks? But primarily it's that 10-factor analysis that NMFS has requested we do.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:37] Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:09:42] And I assume that is by the GMT. And would the GAP play a role there?

Lynn Mattes [00:09:50] Through the Chair, Mr. Gorelnik, I think up to this point it has been a combination of Council staff, and NMFS staff, Mr. Phillips and Miss Moyer. I don't know what the plan moving forward is, how involved the GAP and the GMT would be involved. I would defer to Mr. Phillips as the lead analyst on that.

Todd Phillips [00:10:12] Yes, through the Chair. Yes, thank you for the question Mr. Gorelnik. At this point the Action Team needs to have a little bit more discussion on that, but it is largely up to myself as the lead staff on this particular action as well as Miss Moyer, and I believe we may have voluntasked our newest staff member Katrina to assist in some of this. But at this point we haven't, I haven't talked about the GMT or the GAP and their assistance. If the Council wishes to give guidance on that we would definitely appreciate it. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:52] Thank you Todd. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:10:52] Thank you Mr. Chair. Could you scroll up please so I could see the top? Down just a little bit, sorry. Thank you. I just wanted to confirm everything was on the list. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:19] Okay. All right, no more discussion? Okay, Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:11:28] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I just wanted to offer some comforting thoughts actually on the workload for this. I've done that 10-factor analysis before in New England. And when I worked the New England mid-Atlantic regions on river herring and shad and it's 10 questions, and this is a big list, but I was just speaking to Todd offline to say for some of the species the answer for like Number 8, for example, may be the same, and so some of the binning that Keeley referred to is that there are efficiencies to be found as you're working through this that, yeah as like once you, yeah I think of it as like once you write up one answer for something, that same answer might apply very easily in another area. And so this could seem, yeah if you do 10 times this list it seems insane, but there probably is, I think as you guys start to go through it, there is some economy that will happen from just doing the analysis in certain places. So it seems like a big elephant if we're going to keep doing this analogy, but it can become a smaller elephant to eat if the work is done in the right way. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:48] Thank you Aja. All right, anymore discussion? I don't see any hands so I'm going to call for the question. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:13:02] Sorry Mr. Chair. I was slow and get my hand up. But Lynn, just a question about bank rockfish. I have too many tabs open to find the GMT Report, but it might have been different than the GMT Report, is the....do you have a response or knowledge of whether it is different from what's in the GMT Report?

Lynn Mattes [00:13:29] Through the Chair, Mr. Niles, just looking at Table 1 in the GMT Report, I do see that bank rockfish is on the left-hand side of the table. I think bank rockfish may have come from the initial copy of the B Table from the analytical document I looked at. I don't know enough about bank rockfish to know which place it should be. So thank you for catching that probably copy and paste error.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:03] Is bank rockfish in industry called red widow by chance? Okay, yeah that's, that should be outside three miles, yeah. That's caught in the trawl fishery so good catch Corey. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:14:25] Thanks, well some credit goes to the internet for the GMT folks. But I thought this was a nice way of doing the motions, but now I wouldn't.....don't know the most....if we want to put it back on the other list what the best way to do that would be.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:41] I guess it's not in the other one, right? So it's not in both. I don't have it in front of me, the last motion, or the first one. Let's find out where we're at here first. It is there? Okay so we just.....it would be a motion to delete then, right? Yeah, so I think what we can do is basically amend this motion to remove bank rockfish.

Corey Niles [00:15:38] I think the internet is telling me there might be a couple there. Could we have a two-minute break maybe?

Brad Pettinger [00:15:46] Okay, let's...

Corey Niles [00:15:47] Or just pause for a second?

Brad Pettinger [00:15:52] Let's pause, yep. Is there something more here? All right, well I think we have it figured out. So with that, I'm going to turn to Christa Svensson to lay out the next moves.

Christa Svensson [00:16:31] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. So firstly I'd like to make an amendment to this motion, and then I will speak briefly to it. And followed by that I am likely to make a motion to reconsider, but we cannot do that until we have completed business on the floor. So with that, in terms of the amendment, I would like to strike "Bank Rockfish" from the table above and add "Pinkrose Rockfish" to the table. Pinkrose rockfish, excuse me.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:20] Okay. Is that language accurate?

Christa Svensson [00:17:22] Yes, although I don't know if we need to actually update the table as well in this amendment or if just the guidance would be sufficient for the Council?

Merrick Burden [00:17:34] (Off-mic) I think it's captured.

Christa Svensson [00:17:36] Okay, perfect. Then yes it is actual and correct to my knowledge.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:42] All right, so you can speak to you as much as appropriate so.

Christa Svensson [00:17:46] Yes, we have had a number of our Management Team members and our Council members who have noted that we have.....yeah, sure.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:02] Can I get a second? Corey. Okay, now we're good.

Christa Svensson [00:18:07] Thank you. And actually.....

Brad Pettinger [00:18:09] My bad.

Christa Svensson [00:18:09]If you'd let it roll it would have gone anyway. That's the beautiful thing about not having a second. If people don't act on it and you still vote on it you're fine. But with regard to this, we had a number of rockfish that were looked at, reviewed, and we noticed that there was an error in the table or a couple of changes to the table. So the intention of this amendment is to have a list that everybody who's been deeply involved with this are in agreement upon.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:44] All right, very good. So all right, any discussion or questions? Okay, it's pretty self-explanatory. So all right, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:18:55] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:55] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Very good. That takes us to an amended motion on the floor. Christa?

Christa Svensson [00:19:09] No.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:09] All right, so any discussion on the amended motion? All right I'll call the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:19:19] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:21] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the amended motion passes unanimously. So Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:19:29] All right, thank you. I got my hand up a little early a moment ago. I would like to make a motion to reconsider the second motion that was made previously.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:41] Okay, very good. Looking for a second? Corey Ridings. Thank you. Please speak to your amended motion.

Christa Svensson [00:19:50] Well actually we need to vote on the motion to reconsider and then I will make the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:59] Yes, I'm sorry.

Christa Svensson [00:19:59] Can you call the vote please on this motion?

Brad Pettinger [00:20:05] All right. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:20:08] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:10] Opposed? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously.

Christa Svensson [00:20:16] Okay. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:17] That's my first time I've done that so.

Christa Svensson [00:20:18] I know it, and thank you as the unofficial parliamentarian in the group. So the motion that I would like to make would be to remove "Pinkrose Rockfish" from the table found currently in Motion 2. Yes, excuse me, thank you, ODFW Motion 2.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:51] Okay. Is the language accurate on the screen?

Christa Svensson [00:20:54] Yes, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:55] All right, Looking for a second? Seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. All right, speak to your motion as appropriate.

Christa Svensson [00:21:00] Yeah, thank you. So firstly, I'd like to recognize the amount of work that was done by ODF and W and particularly Lynn Mattes on this topic. There are a lot of species and a lot of work and thought has gone into this. That being said, in moving pinkrose rockfish into Motion 3, this motion, the intent is to just harmonize what we are doing with our process.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:34] Okay. Any discussion? Okay, none needed. All right, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:21:43] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:45] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. So thank you Christa. Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:21:54] Thank you Mr. Chair. I hate to bring more fun to this. I do not believe greenblotched rockfish is on any of the tables. That'd be greenblotched, B-L-O-T-C-H-E-D. Thank you. All the greens got me.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:15] Okay so that takes care of those three motions, right, as far as the original motion. So and I hear we may have one more maybe? So Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:22:27] Thank you Chair. I'm going to take a bite of this elephant. I have a motion. I move to include groundfish species designated as Ecosystem Component species as identified in the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan Table 3-3 for analysis and consideration under the range of alternatives.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:57] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate Corey?

Corey Ridings [00:23:01] It is.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:02] Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:23:09] Thank you Chair. During discussion today and reading the excellent document that Mr. Phillips and NMFS pulled together, it became clear that the intent is really to do a full and comprehensive analysis. So as the process moves forward, I think it makes a lot of sense to include the Ecosystem Component species that we already have in our FMP because we are considering moving species to e-species as part of this larger process. So in the spirit of that consistency and wanting to be thorough with this opportunity to do this fuller analysis, it makes sense to me to include those species. Fortunately we have a very convenient list of them in our FMP, which is what I'm pulling from here.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:04] Okay, thank you Corey. Questions on the motion? Discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:24:13] Thank you Chair. I'll be quick because I think I'm between us and eating elephant for lunch. I appreciate Miss Ridings bringing this up. It wasn't included in the previous motions as an oversight. It wasn't deliberate. It wasn't strategic. It was just a pure oversight so thank you for correcting that.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:38] Thank you Lynn. All right, Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:24:38] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Miss Ridings for the motion. Just help me in the sea of tables we've been looking at, could you point me to that quickly or at least give me an approximate how many species are currently EC that would need additional review on top of those we've already tasked Council staff with? Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:59] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:24:59] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair, Miss McKnight. Strangely enough I have this table open. We have a total of 12, I don't want to call them species, but some of those, there are at least 12 species, but we also have groups. So there's one called "Other", "all other skates", which is all this group of fish, or skates rather. So there's at least 12 entries there, but then there are those that are like, as I mentioned, that are groups. So all grenadiers, all skates, yeah. Does that make sense Miss McKnight?

Brad Pettinger [00:25:39] Good? Okay. All right, further discussion? I'm not seeing any, oh, Keeley?

Keeley Kent [00:25:52] Thanks. I don't feel like I've had enough time to consider this, especially just in the very brief looking at the list and realizing that even some of the language in Table 3-3, it doesn't even tell us how many species. So I, right, so some of that language just says, "all other grenadiers". I have no idea how many species that is, and so from a workload perspective I feel

unprepared to be able to comment on this. And so for from this time I would probably abstain from voting and would just suggest that more time to evaluate the workload implications of this with Council staff would benefit NMFS. So apologies, I'm a little....wasn't prepared for this. I'm so sorry about that.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:45] Okay, thank you. Caroline McKnight, please, unless Corey you wanted to.....Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:26:50] Thanks Chair. Thanks Keeley for that. I guess I could speak to it a little bit more in the sense, and I don't know if it's appropriate with the motion as written, but certainly the intent would be to take the spirit and intention behind these species in Table 3.3 and defer to your and Mr. Phillips expertise on sort of the depth on what sort of "all other grenadiers" or "all other skates" actually means. Certainly when I looked at this I saw the number 12 and didn't think that that was an overly burdensome additional workload especially after what we've heard today on the floor. So if that helps at all that is my intention.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:48] Thank you Corey. All right, Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:27:48] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Miss Ridings. I am hesitant only because I'm not sure I'm understanding what this motion is asking. The species that we've already moved and recommended today have gone through a framework and through a heavy analytical burden to get to a place of then further consideration and so I guess my question is we're assuming these are EC species, so is it to go back to the framework first of the 25% or historical fishing mortality and then come back to be considered for further, or is this sort of skipping that framework and jumping right to the three options? So thank you for clarification there.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:35] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:28:35] Chair, Caroline, yes my intent was to sort of skip that first part and just move them into the range of analysis as we're moving forward from this point forward. You know, going back in time maybe it should have been added when we took the very first bite at the elephant, I'm not sure, but upon reviewing materials that we looked at today it seemed most appropriate at this point to add them in here. Again, I would defer to the expertise of NMFS and Mr. Phillips in terms of the appropriateness and application to that range.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:11] Okay, Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:29:14] Thanks. And thanks Miss Ridings for the further discussion on this. I think what you're saying sounds fine to me, but the language of the motion seems a bit constraining for not having had any opportunity to explore this yet. So I'm wondering if you would be open to softening it a bit, and I agree with you I certainly have said holistic examination a number of times, but I don't think this is just 12 species. There it says, "all skates" in the endemic species, right? And so I just want some more time. So if you would be amenable to just softening the request, I think we could work with Council staff on bringing back more information about the existing EC species, but putting them into the framework right now on top of what I see as already a substantial workload between March and June without having done any of this initial exploration of these species feels a bit off, but I'm not disagreeing with the point of reviewing these, just sort of maybe suggesting a slightly softer pathway that we could bring back more information in the interim that

isn't necessarily the full consideration under the three alternatives and wondering whether that would meet your immediate needs.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:38] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:30:38] Thank you Chair. Thank you Keeley. I am amenable to softening. I will confess I'm not entirely sure what that means in this current moment of this motion. Looking at it right now maybe there could be a friendly amendment to take out the word "consideration" and leave for analysis if that would perhaps meet that need for softening.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:04] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:31:09] I'm also, I said it but I apologize, I'm not sure in this moment, especially not being in the room with you I don't have language. I could try on the fly. It would be very painful for you all in the room to try to come up with something. I apologize. Maybe I will ask around the table if anyone has an idea or perhaps Executive Director Burden has any.....sorry, sorry, Merrick to put on the.....if you have an idea of softening just for the moment of trying to, yes, because I'm getting some info from Mr. Phillips that it is certainly more than 12, at least of all the species that we know fall into some of these lines. So I apologize and I don't want to drag this out further. If I am the only one who could provide some softening, I will try to work up something very quickly but I would probably need a moment or two.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:13] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:32:13] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman and Miss Kent. My hand went up before you volunteered me so no problem. I don't think an amendment here would be necessary if we get on the same page because the language is sufficiently general that we should just have an understanding about what we do. So as I am sitting here communicating with Mr. Phillips, and I'll ask him if he wants to step in at any time to do so, but as I'm communicating with Mr. Phillips, I think if we think of the range of alternatives as there are several layers in the analysis, and Todd, you know, walked through that starting with the 25% factor and then there's the multi-factor analysis and all that stuff. If we want to soften this a bit and look at it with respect to the first layer, the 25% analysis, that might be what Keeley is getting at. Let's look at that and maybe that tells us something more and tells us how much further we want to go. I do think if we proceeded with the 10-factor analysis after that, we're looking at potentially quite a bit more work. But I do think the 25 percent threshold is pretty illuminating in the data that we've seen and so if that starts to provide enough of a sense about whether you want to continue to proceed and continue to analyze EC species after that point we can do that, but I would say let's start there and then come back in June and see if you want to dig any deeper on them. Todd, would you add anything to that?

Todd Phillips [00:33:54] Through the Chair. Yes, Mr. Burden I agree with what you're saying. I think if that 25%, or at least the process we've established indicates something different than EC species, then we can move forward. Otherwise it would just in theory revert to being EC stock and there'd be no reason to reanalyze it. Does that make sense?

Brad Pettinger [00:34:26] Okay. Keeley, do you have a response to that?

Keeley Kent [00:34:30] I am okay with that if Director Burden is okay with that and I think we would follow-up with Council staff after this and I appreciate the acknowledgement that there's flexibility intended in this and just want to be clear on the expectation setting, which it sounds like we are. So I appreciate all of that discussion and I apologize for dragging this out a bit more.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:53] Okay. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:34:54] I'm just confused so.....sorry Mr. Chair. I was, and others were on the GMT when we did this, first cut at this following the National Standard Guideline revisions back in whenever that was, 2009. If the question of whether these stocks are in 25% in federal waters, I can tell you right now all the answers is yes to all of those. Those come, where they came from was, and this opportunity to, we don't do it often enough, recognize the extraordinary data collection that we have through the observer programs, both the at-sea whiting and the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program. So where those came from was just taking every species you see in the bottom trawl fisheries is the one that gets these, other than shortbellies maybe the exception, you see it in the whiting. That's where these came from, from their bottom trawl catches where they're speciated by the observers and they appeared in the data. And all of their grenadiers might just be the ones they couldn't speciate. And maybe the FMP was another cut at it but I think I saw Lynn nod her head these would all be bottom trawl caught fish and yes they're all 25% in federal waters because that's where they're seeing the grenadiers are deep. So I don't think any of these species are going to rise to the level of catch where we think they're in need of conservation and management unless the catches have just changed so much from back then that. These were, the catches were in the catch but they were small. And just last funny way to say we all had lots of jokes about fine scale coddling name and so this is triggering my memory of going through this.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:57] Thanks Corey. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:36:57] Thank you, and just so that I make sure that I'm understanding what happens with this. If what Corey says is the case that we've looked at observer data to support placing them as EC species in the FMP right now, my understanding is that if they're kind of moved onto the list for consideration then they kind of get kicked into that first table, the Group 1 list, and then we would automatically designate them as EC species again if we have a lot of information there to support that. So even though they're like, yeah, they're the 25 and above so they go on that first list and then we automatically, this may be, our analysis may determine that we would automatically select the alternative that replaces them as EC species again. Is that a fair interpretation of how that would play out?

Brad Pettinger [00:37:50] I would look maybe to Todd on that one. Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:37:54] Could you ask that question again Miss Szumylo?

Aja Szumylo [00:37:57] Sure, thank you. So the way that I'm thinking of, yeah, and again this is not quite the softening that I heard, but the way I would think of this flowing is that we have this list in the FMP already. We know that there are probably 25% or more caught in federal water, so they bump onto that first list that we made a motion about, and then the range of alternatives includes options to list them as EC species. So what might happen in our analysis is we might automatically then reselect them as EC species again. The same way that we already have stocks in the FMP and we're selecting an alternative to designate it someplace using the range of

alternatives that we have. Does that make sense? Or does that sound like an accurate portrayal of what could happen to folks?

Brad Pettinger [00:38:45] Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:38:45] Yes, through the Chair, that was how I was trying to articulate my comments to Mr. Burden that yes, poorly worded, but thank you for entertaining a repetition of that common question.

Brad Pettinger [00:39:00] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:39:00] Could I just make a suggestion? And I should have noted first that soupfin shark and shortbelly are probably the two different ones on there that they used to be in the FMP. Can we just look at whether catches have changed? That should be the, that should be in the WCGOP data set? I don't know if they put it all in the groundfish mortality but can we just... would that be a next step of just....and I think we have GMT feedback that, yeah, you kind of see these de minimis in the IFQ fisheries still, but the simple way of doing it in my mind was, has catch jumped considerably or notably since we've....since these were out of the FMP that just seems like the parsimonious way of evaluating whether they're still good EC species or not without.....and that's really just not to diminish the work, but it's working with the WCGOP data, when a time series of catch since two thousand whatever, nine, ten.

Brad Pettinger [00:40:04] So maybe if I just clarify, so if this would, if we vote on this with that consideration that basically this would just trigger people to look at those species to see if anything's changed and if they go beyond that. Is that what we're kind of saying here? Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:40:25] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and thank you Mr. Niles. I would just point out as someone who's not doing the analysis it's easy for me to wax poetic, but I would just point out that other Councils look at EC species in this way, so if there is a change in the trajectory of the catch that will trigger a review of whether that species should be left in that bucket. So that is doable. There's some precedent for that. And I guess I would then have to turn back to Miss Ridings and just ask, like, would that be considered in your opinion, consistent with considering it in the alternatives? Like, there would be something that would lead us to considering them as part of the alternatives at some point.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:18] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:41:18] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:18] Okay, all right. Corey, other Corey, sorry.

Corey Niles [00:41:20] I think the other point is that you won't see these species at least in Washington State, they won't even be on a fish ticket because they're not, they would be miscellaneous fish. So yeah, it would just be, it would be observer data is where that came from, except again for shortbelly and, we're not calling soupfin shark soupfin shark anymore and I'm forgetting what we.....tope shark? But those would be the exceptions.

Brad Pettinger [00:41:43] Okay. All right, so everybody understands where we're at with that then, right? Okay, further discussion? Todd, you want to make.....

Todd Phillips [00:41:58] Oh, yes thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Burden is putting me on the spot. One potential way around the workload is we do have a GMT that could do this analysis for the Council. Not that I want to task them because they're all giving me death eyes at the moment, but they do have that ability.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:23] Okay. Well, we do have a motion on the floor so help me out here. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:42:34] I agree with what Mr. Phillips says and I think we vote on it they can figure out who does the work.

Brad Pettinger [00:42:42] Okay. Does that look good? All right. Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:42:58] Okay, just since this did result in a bit of a conversation, the Chair and I just want to make sure that everyone's clear what this results in. So with this language there would be an analysis that is focusing on changes in the catch trajectory of EC species. There's a question about who does that. I don't think we have to deal with that now. But then that would then lead to some further consideration in June about whether to continue on with incorporating any of those within the range of alternatives. That's how I see this happening. So if there's any question about that process I'm happy to elaborate, but that's where I believe we are.

Brad Pettinger [00:43:49] Okay. All right. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:43:49] One last, I think we also.....I think shortbelly will be spoken about, or is on the list for the workload management measures later today, so we can talk about that one there.

Brad Pettinger [00:44:03] Very good. Okay, I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:44:09] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:44:10] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously and that takes us to Todd, how we're doing here?

Todd Phillips [00:44:21] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. In looking at your action here, your Council tasks, so you did, the Council did through motion approve the proposed 25% and have adopted the ROA to species 2 Alternatives and have identified many species as PPA, given their stock, for stock definitions. And regarding the EC species, you have given guidance, which Mr. Burden just went through, which is essentially to look at changes in direction of catch compared to when it was first determined to be EC, or identified as EC. To whom does, to who that work goes to, I guess it's still a bit of a discussion or consideration rather. Long way of saying, I believe we have enough to move forward with this action and bring it back in June. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:45:13] All right, very good. Thank you all. And with that we're going to break for lunch.

7. Limited Entry Fixed Gear Actions; Gear Endorsements, Cost Recovery, and Other Administrative Changes

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Alright, with that I'll open the floor for discussion. David Sones.

David Sones [00:00:07] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I might want to speak a little bit on the slinky pot since it was mentioned in with a couple of the testimonies. And the problem we were having on the North Coast is when those whales would show up, I mean it was devastating. It was almost to the point guys just said I'm not going out. I'm losing all my fish to these whales and all my expenses are going down the drain. So this slinky pot idea came up and guys started.....the beauty part of them is they're small. You can compress them on a small boat. Our boats weren't having to change their hydraulic systems to lift them and they were able to pack enough of them and realize the whales did leave them alone. They haven't had any whales bother them since they've been using them. And then they realized some other benefits. The birds was one, you're not sending hooks out with the birds can grab. The bait costs went down a lot, and bait is very expensive now. And as I mentioned before, our crew sizes could operate at a smaller crew size. You don't have to have all these guys baiting hooks as they're coming aboard. So it's really been beneficial to us and we haven't had any problem with whale entanglements. We still use the two vertical lines, but they're very much set just like our longline was set. They were able to use the same, a little bigger longline size, but they've been able to use the same hydraulics. Took them a little while tinkering with them to see how many they could put on a string and be able to lift at a time and then they probably, if they really get loaded, they got a couple hundred pounds in them and a couple strong guys can wrestle them over the, over the rail. But it really has been beneficial to us up there to the point where this year in our management plans and with the large black cod numbers we started in January and allowed our tribal fishermen.... because it was only being able to be used in our individual tribal allocations. Makah, Quileute, and Quinault have different allocations a certain time of the year, but this year they've combined some of those and each of the tribes can use those if they choose, but it's really been a huge benefit to us to be able to get those out there and we're using them. A few guys were skeptical at first because they're just not used to new things and it was a new thing that you had to learn to kind of figure out how to be efficient with them, but they seem to be really happy with having those pots. And I believe they were talking about the, you know, the whales biting through them up in Alaska, but the manufacturer sounds like he may have some solutions to that but we haven't had that problem and we haven't had any whale entanglements because they're not individual pots with a line and buoy on them, they're just pretty much like a longline would be set so. I can see why these guys are serious about wanting to do that, particularly on the North Coast, because when the whales show up they can stay there for months and they really pick the best fish right off of your line, and I mean it was just devastating and they almost wanted to quit black cod fishing because of it, but that has really bailed us out. So it's been a great tool for us and we'll continue to use it and we can get more information out to the National Marine Fisheries Service or the agencies and states that are interested in that.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:59] Thank you David. Very good. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:59] Thank you Chair. Thinking about the license for the various gears, sorry, words are hard at the moment. I think we've all realized we're in a moment of we've got a lot of change going on, changing in markets, changing in weather, changing in ocean conditions, and if there's ways we can allow the most flexibility for the folks fishing within their permit, within their

sector, that should help them be the most efficient they can and adapt to things as we're going on. I do hope that there's some additional communication between now and when this comes back in the PPA about the unintended, like fixed set net gear just to ensure that we aren't accidentally opening up something we didn't intend to, but I'm very supportive of allowing some additional flexibility and nimbleness within our fishing fleet.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:03] All right, thanks Lynn. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:05:03] Thank you Chair. And I wanted to thank Council staff, Miss Waller, for the excellent analysis that's in the briefing book. I think it was really easy to walk through. I agree with the presentation and starting in the way, way back, it's always helpful to see where we've been to orient us to where we're trying to go. And in particular, thinking about the fixed gear review and that that started in 2020, if I'm remembering right, and here we are finally on the actions that we have been working toward to provide that flexibility and I'm looking forward to putting forward a PPA. And I have a motion ready if, but I don't want to stall the discussion if folks have more they want to say but thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:59] All right, it's good to know. All right. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:06:13] Sorry, technical difficulty. Apologies. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just have some general comments. I appreciate the presentation. It was very good. 52 slides is impressive Jessi. Thank you for getting us through all those. The thing that stood out for me in the presentation material was, I think the number was 60 latent permits that are sitting there and that was giving me a little bit of pause and concern and listening to the GMT be really, really clear that that could mean adjustments to trip limits and changes in dynamics, that was giving me a little bit of heartburn but I really appreciate Mr. Lapham's testimony because that just sort of came all together for me when he said, we'll adapt, don't worry about that, we'll adapt and we'll figure it out. So I feel very good with the GAP Report, what's laid in front of us. And I'm very happy to see there's some very old remnants that are being taken care of. That always feels good when we clean up things from, when you're seeing things like 1980s, that's long overdue, so that's all. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:16] Thanks Caroline. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:07:16] Thank you Chair. This is actually a question for Ms. Waller. Thank you, as everyone else has said, for a great presentation. When you gave us your presentation and looking through the initial review draft, you talked a lot about these different scenarios, and thank you for using that to help illuminate this for us, but they included longline, slinky pot, and pot. And yet Alternative 3, which we've heard a lot of support for, is talking about a whole other possibility of gear types. So I'm just wondering in the analysis how were those other gear types considered?

Brad Pettinger [00:07:58] Jessi.

Jessi Waller [00:07:59] Mr. Chair, Miss Ridings, yes is was a little bit of an interesting one. We didn't, I didn't do a scenario that looked at like a direct move to that gear type because the scenarios were really driven by our concerns with entanglements with whales and turtles. And with that we've had no recorded incidents with other types of hook and line gear, right? Those have been used in open access so haven't had that so that was not the the driver there. Additionally, given

that the only way that LE fixed gear vessels can currently use those other gear types is by switching to the open access sector, it's really difficult to predict, like I mean I can, moving from pot to longline I could make some more but like the shift of like who's going to split off and also do hook and line gear was even more uncertain. Like it's really going to be driven by like, where you're fishing? What you can targeting? Do you already do open access? So it just was one of those things that I try to take care more of a qualitative fashion when it came to like considering impacts to marine mammals or turtles or seabirds and like you see that throughout that there's no expected impacts from increased use of those gears. And then when it comes to the more economic impacts, it's really going to be, you know, that's why I was asking the GAP, I was like, hey, give me the species that you think people are going to target. Like where are we going to see non-trawl attainment? So I hope that helps answer the question. It was just more of those things of like, the scenarios were really driven by the potential risk to entanglements, and since those gear types are not linked to any of that, that's why the focus is on the switch from pot to longline to pot gear.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:50] Okay. Thank you Corey. Anyone else? I'll look maybe for a motion since I don't see any hands. I think it's more discussion, so Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:10:01] I have a motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:03] Wonderful.

Heather Hall [00:10:07] Thank you. I move the Council adopt the recommendations as presented in Agenda Item H.7.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, March 2025 for Limited Entry Fixed Gear Actions as Preliminary Preferred Alternatives.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:26] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

Heather Hall [00:10:28] Yes, it is.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:29] Okay, thank you. Seconded by Aja Szumylo. Please speak to your motion.

Heather Hall [00:10:34] Thank you. I want to note that the recommendations that were presented in the GAP Report also align with what the GMT put forward in their report. Both of them cover gear endorsements, cost recovery, and the administrative actions. And I just want to flag that this, the intention here is for the, under the gear endorsement that it would be Alternative 3. And that would maximize flexibility as we've been talking about. For the base permit, that would be Alternative 1 that removes the base permit designation. For permit price reporting, also Alternative 1 requiring that permit prices be reported upon sale to a new owner for all LEFG permits and that it removes the start and end times and groundfish regulations of the primary sablefish fishery. I also really appreciate the response from Miss Waller on the cost recovery and that the interest of the GAP in having this, the responsibility beyond the harvesters within what was presented in the GAP Report. So I think the alternatives really are well-aligned with the purpose and need and again allows participants to utilize their quota in the most efficient way, encourage new participation, and reducing administrative burdens. I'll leave it there. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:18] Okay, really good. Okay, questions on the motion? Discussion on the motion? All right. It must be time for a break here I think. So all right, I'm going to call for the question. I see no hands. All right, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:12:36] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:36] Abstentions? All right, the motion passed unanimously. Wonderful. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:12:48] Thank you. I did also want to note that in Jessi's presentation the recommendation or just the reference to Amendment 6 and that there's a lot of reference to information from the 1980s in there, and if we could just offer guidance that recognizes that does need some updating and hopefully in a way that preserves that policy relative to the limited entry trip limits and the open access trip limits that we've really been relying on and hope that we can give the latitude to come back and see some proposed edits that adopt that when we come back to this in June.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:32] Wonderful, okay, very good. With that I'll look to Jessi to finish us out here.

Jessi Waller [00:13:40] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, you have completed your action for today. You've selected your PPA so Council staff works with NMFS staff on getting this ready for, we were scheduled for June final action, and we will be also bringing back that FMP language for the Council to take a look at and we'll work to revising some of that Amendment 6 language to kind of bring that up to date.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:05] Fantastic. All righty, let's take a break and be back here at 3.30.

8. Workload and New Management Measures Priorities

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, we have a lot of information, several reports, public comment. Who wants to start, initiate discussion on this agenda item? The tasks are up there on the screen before you. I won't review those now but I thought I saw Chair Pettinger's hand raised.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:21] All right, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Some of these items in the GAP Report seem to be related to the sorts of issues we had contemplated under one of the IRA projects, which we are now calling the Flexible Adaptive Management. We are scheduled to discuss this project in April, and I'm wondering if the ED could speak to the possibility of wrapping up the GAP items into that project for consideration, recognizing the time is short between March and April. The consideration would include some of the topics from the GAP Report. Number one, the Mid-Biennium Harvest Specifications Phase-in Green Light. Two. Harvest Specifications Framework. And the Big "C" Carryover. I understand there was concerns about the benefit of these items when the Council worked on them in 2017 and 2019 when we took up that workload, but I think it's important that we explore these avenues or any others to allow us to be more flexible in our management and respond faster to current conditions on the water. I also wonder how this might tie-in with the ongoing work on risk tables and the potential to use any new ecosystem information in adjusting harvest specifications. We have tools to adjust harvest specifications downward, but no tools to quickly respond to positive information. These measures would benefit all sectors and have the potential to provide not just short-term relief within this biennium, but long-lasting benefits to the groundfish sectors and their communities. So I'd like to ask the ED Burden whether some sort of exploration of these issues would be possible for April given the upcoming briefing book deadline?

Pete Hassemer [00:02:09] Thank you. Executive Director Burden would you like to respond to that?

Merrick Burden [00:02:13] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and appreciate the question Mr. Pettinger, Chair Pettinger. Let's see, as we all know we do have, we were successful in securing all three of the grants that we proposed last year. So Chair Pettinger's question was in regards to one of the proposals within one of those grants. One of the proposals there did focus on essentially adaptive management, that wasn't the title of it, but it was speeding up adaptive management, getting better at adaptive management. That proposal contemplated climate change as the driver and needing greater adaptation in the face of climate change. As I sit here and think about what adaptation looks like, it strikes me that it probably doesn't matter what the driver is. That regardless of whether we're responding to change in the environment or a change in some measurement, our need as an institution to be more adaptive, I think it should look the same is my initial impression. And so as part of that project we did propose to apply a adaptive, a more adaptive approach to one or more management actions within our FMP, and that's the desire to move from big picture ecosystem concept down into fisheries management, which is really hard to do, but we did propose to do that in that proposal. So if you follow my logic I think we could make that connection here and wouldn't necessarily be the only connection that we would make as part of that proposal. I think there are other opportunities to improve our adaptation, but I think the logic holds that this could be consistent with one of those proposals in that grant. Let's see, Mr. Pettinger you'll have to remind me what your other questions were?

Brad Pettinger [00:04:23] I guess how that would look like as far as for April? Obviously we've got pretty well things lined up and how that would work with and staff put together something for information reports so we could have something on it for work planning and then for later on in the year and not mess up the April schedule too much.

Merrick Burden [00:04:46] Yes, thank you for that reminder of your question. So as I have chatted with my staff here and listened to some of the testimony from the GAP, there are several items that were highlighted in the GAP Report that link back to prior work that has been done, so if that is the focus of this Council is on the priorities that the GAP made reference to, I don't think it's a big lift to collate that prior material, have it available to you in April as a way to start focusing and having an informed discussion about how to prioritize and how to move through that work in order to respond to some of the troubles that the industry and the recreational community have brought to us. So I do think it is a doable lift to get something in front of you in April to help have a more coherent discussion, help you prioritize and focus what it is you really would like to do. If we're talking about things that are not in the GAP statement I'm not sure what extra work we could do, but I think those matters that were referenced specifically in the GAP statement are doable for us to bring something back to you at the next Council meeting. Is that answering your question Mr. Chairman?

Brad Pettinger [00:06:07] I think it does. If I could continue?

Pete Hassemer [00:06:12] Yes, if it's along those lines then.....

Brad Pettinger [00:06:15] You've got a question? Okay. I'll just continue reading what I got here as far as it lays things out nicely. So the goal of these items would be to find both near term and longer term solutions to the situation facing the groundfish fishery. We need to find ways to be more reactive to new information coming into our process, especially from those actually on the water. On the near term, in order to do anything prior to the next biennium, we need the ability to find a mid-biennium harvest specifications adjustment as currently we do, we can only change a harvest specification in a biennium due to an error. A mid-biennium harvest specification adjustment could be needed as a result of an emerging issue as we're having now with shortspine, canary or any other stock, or in that case a new stock assessment coming in that might have a positive light. There's a discussion about big "C" carryover I think here. That would provide additional unharvested catch from one year to another. I thought Sarah did a good job of explaining how that would work, what happens now, why it would work. Right now the majority of stocks we manage have an ABC equals ACL that are highly underattained. The allowance of NS1 allows us that unharvested catch to be carried over. The allowance of NS1 allows that unharvested catch to be carried over, recognize that this would require work for SSC to potentially set new OFL, ABCs. And I think we need to explore what that would look like. We've always put Band-Aids on things, and what we're looking at is seriously something long term to take the pressure off everybody to try to fit ourselves in the little boxes we make every year. And it seems to.....As I look at here the canary issue coming up, and everybody's worried about canary and it's causing everybody else conflict between people, between groups. And if you actually had a real, true carryover within the biological limits that have been set that would meet the scientific, at least what the SSC would sign-off on, and we have talked to them, or they have issued papers that say that you can harvest next year as long as you take into consideration natural mortality. So as long as you stay within the constraints long term we should be fine and I would look forward to having some true flexibility that we've been talking about forever and we just never get. So I'll stop there.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:54] Thank you. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:08:57] Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to comment, I think, on the proposed way forward. But Merrick had said, just to set some expectations, and I appreciate the comments by the Chair, right, and what we've heard today regarding seeking increased flexibility both in the short term and long term. But just as a reminder, you know, this agenda item was always set up that once we set the priorities, you know, it wasn't necessarily a guarantee they would immediately be agendaized. We had to have resources available to take them on both at Council staff and in NMFS level. So while I appreciate the approach that Merrick has outlined, I just want to be clear from an expectations perspective, there won't be much ability for NMFS to engage between now and April. We did voice some concerns back in 2017 with the way those items that are listed here amongst those D items and the way they were characterized, so hopefully you will be able to pull that when you are pulling back what was discussed at the Council. But you know we are pretty consumed right now preparing for a potential a furlough starting next week. It's only a few weeks until the next meeting. And if we were then to start to agendaize this going forward past April, as is the case under this agenda item, that means other things would have to be de-prioritized, and that could include actions this Council has already taken final action on that we have not yet gotten to take the final rulemaking on because it's the same people who would be working on those that would be working on trying to implement this. I just want to set expectations that as always under this agenda item there can be a cascade effect into not just future items but also ones this Council has already talked about when we bump something up on the top of the priority list. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:55] Thank you. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:10:58] Yeah, thank you Mr. Wulff. Certainly appreciate those remarks and definitely appreciate the state of things and the uncertainty that's in front of us. As I envision what we could bring forward in April and what the purpose of an April discussion would be, I think of two things. One is I don't think there's time for anyone to do much between now and April, it's right around the corner. And so that then helps me think about what the intention of that April agenda item would look like. And in my opinion, it's to help us have a clear-eyed discussion about this. And right now we have a lot of ideas and we still need to take another step and figure out, here are these problems that the industry is telling us they need desperate help with and we need a focused discussion about what we can do in relatively short order, and I don't think we're quite there yet. And so the formal word we use in our FMP is scoping. And so this would be the first of maybe a three-meeting process that would get us somewhere this year. But as part of that process we would be considering what is your capacity? What is our capacity? What is the capacity of the GMT and maybe even others? Those are all valid concerns and I think the April item helps us have that conversation.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:21] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:24] Thank you Vice-Chair. In regards....I appreciate trying to find creative solutions, creative ways to address major issues. My question is, has the RFP for this IRA project already gone out? And if it has, is it worded in such a way that this could be contained within what was contained within the RFP? If the RFP says we're going to do A and this is Q. Or if the RFP says we're going to do A through Z and this is Q, just some concerns about if the RFP has already gone out and how this might fit there?

Pete Hassemer [00:13:02] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:13:04] Yes, thank you. Appreciate that question. I would say I'm not concerned about that. Not every proposal that we have put together necessitates an RFP. I use....there are different rules and honestly some judgment I have about doing sole source, doing RFPs. So what I tend to do is if there are very large projects we're doing I'll submit an RFP out to the world. If there are smaller, very discreet things I tend not to. And I would put this most likely in that latter camp where we would find a sole source and someone that knows how to do this work to step in right away. So I appreciate your question, but it's not an obstacle for us at the moment.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:47] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:53] Thank you. Then a second question, and again it's going to sound like I'm not in favor of finding a solution, I am. But we had a lengthy discussion two, three days ago when we were talking about the ecosystem items that we don't have workload capacity. You guys are, Council is down a staff member. We don't have capacity to do something that isn't in our FEP to do. And now we're talking about taking on something that I see being orders of magnitude more workload. Having been involved in the previous analysis of these, and I'm struggling to find where a balance between what we say we can do, what we say we can't do, and the why behind it? If we don't have enough workload for the ecosystem stuff, how do we have enough workload for all this stuff? I know sometimes it's often different people, but there's a lot of things in this list people want. And again I'm not opposed to this, I'm just trying to find where that line is, where that balance is, how we're making that determination of, well we're short-staffed but we can take this one other thing on, but we're short-staffed and we can't do this thing we're supposed to do. I'm struggling there and maybe I'm just trying to talk to the breeze at the moment but I'm struggling.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:11] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:15:14] Yeah, thank you. And I expected this question. It is....first I would say, yes, we do need to be cognizant of our workload. And as I am outlining a possible way forward with some resources I continue to be concerned about our workload. If we contrast this agenda item with some of the questions that I was raising under the ecosystem agenda item a couple of days ago, first thing that's on my mind are that the people are different and what was going through my mind at that time was the work of the SSC which we can't contract out and that is now short-staffed. Whereas with this project we have some more flexibility because we can bring in a contractor. And I think that is the main distinction and provides us with a different, a different set of considerations about workload as we move forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:18] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:16:21] Thanks Vice. Thanks Mr. Pettinger. Thanks Mr. Burden for this thinking and sharing with us. In terms of talking about IRA projects, you know those have been a long time coming. They had a very specific origin for some that came from NMFS. I understand and appreciate the flexibility Mr. Burden. I think you talked earlier this meeting, perhaps it was about some wording in that and the ability, and you just talked now, to be able to use that second bucket that was designed around flexibility for this. But the IRA money in those buckets are really a cross fishery thing that as those were developed and as we've talked about what that work was

going to look like, we talked about that in the context across our fisheries, and so I'm struggling a little bit now in an agenda item where we are discussing and prioritizing groundfish items to be suddenly pulling in an entirely different body of work with its own intentions that have been in the pipeline for a couple years to do something that we just saw on paper for the first time an hour ago. So maybe there's a reaction to that, or maybe that's a suggestion that we finish our work here under this agenda item today, go through what we've seen, prioritize the table, talk about the table, and then move this larger discussion to workload planning. Because I will agree a bit with Miss Mattes, I'm perhaps a bit confused, but I think in any time where we have workload issues where we're looking at decreased resources, that we need to be as careful and as transparent as we can when we decide what we are going to do with the resources we have.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:16] Thank you. Did you want to respond to that or? I'm not sure. The question, go ahead if you want.

Merrick Burden [00:18:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And those are very good questions Miss Ridings. And I don't have a great answer. I would just say that as part of this proposal in the IRA, broader IRA proposal, there was the contemplation that we would apply this approach to one or more fishery management actions. And so that we would bring it down into something that's as acute as what we're talking about now. And so whether this is the best use of money, best use for that, I guess that should be up to you all. But I do think it's consistent with the rationale. The approach does seem sudden to decide that now, but I don't think it's inconsistent with the proposal. So that's my response at the moment but happy to keep entertaining questions.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:28] Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:19:30] Thank you Vice-Chair. Excuse me. I just wanted to echo some of what Mr. Burden said. I see.....well two things come to mind, one is that when we were given the IRA money times were different and I think that we do need to be creative and flexible about how we maintain those priorities once the admin.....like with the shifting administration. And I think in this case looking at how to create flexible approaches for fisheries does sound very in line with both the original IRA priority that the Council identified and with this new administration's thrust towards deregulation and supporting businesses. So I think we all need to, especially with those items that are tricky because of how they were focused before, look for creative opportunities for ways to use them going forward and to continue to support fisheries, and I think this is a really strong way to do that. I, when I first came on the Council in September and I saw that agenda item, this is exactly what I had in mind for it. I had a lot of thoughts about things that we should have been doing under Magnuson to create room for people that can happen faster or can allow room for people to respond to a changing environment quickly. And I know that this case is coming up under groundfish, but it's really hard to ignore the energy and the calls for help from a group that is speaking so loudly in unison about something when we have an opportunity to fit priorities that we're moving through with along with them. And then the other thing, something just slipped to my mind. Maybe it'll come back to me later, but I do....oh that was what it was, sorry, excuse me, it's late in the day and we got up too early this morning. I see a potential here to use some of the flexibility and the tricks that we might look at in specifications flexibility not just for this fishery but for some of our other Council managed fisheries. CPS is one that comes to mind first. It's the most like groundfish in shape and form. I will not speak about salmon because I'm not qualified enough to speak about salmon and I know that HMS is very different, but this, the approaches here could fit in other places too, and I expect that if we were to take this up under a broader agenda

item that we would try to look for opportunities to use these approaches in other places as well. We have a really clear need and case for them over in groundfish at the moment, but let's, yeah, let's use our minds to see if this can benefit the entire set of fisheries that we look in that we manage. So I see a lot of synergy there and support that and welcome other Council members comments on the alignment between these items and those items.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:38] Thank you. Other discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:22:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just want to comment that there's a reason this discussion is always difficult. And there's a reason that many of these items that have been sitting on the B list have been there for years. And I can appreciate that it's difficult when there's a perception of maybe things are jumping in front of the other, but I think that's only indicative of the moment in time that we're in right now. I'm hearing, you know, a list of items from the GAP that are not new per se or new to the paper, but are being brought back up after years of various conversation or analysis from the past. I mean my first meeting on the GMT we were talking about green light and how we could or couldn't make it work. The scenario and circumstances then are much different than they are now and I think that warrants these items being put forward. And what gives me less consternation about the workload is Mr. Wulff's comment that just because they go on the list and they're prioritized doesn't necessitate immediately that it's going to be put on the YAG, but it's a discussion that can be iterative and happen over the few meetings or longer to determine how we get there, and before we know it we'll be back here in a year to discuss again, potentially, whether that made it or not. So I don't see this as permanent or finite, but iterative at all for all of them. I do just want to make some general comments about a handful of the items both from the GMT and the GAP statement that struck me, as you heard from my line of questioning, as being taken up in the existing scheduled workload, whether that's trawl program review, whether it's intersector allocation review, or specifications. Those are our core functions and specifications is where we have to continue grinding no matter what. And so I feel like there's a few here that probably could get taken up in those processes just fine, even though I understand why they're on the advisory body list and why everyone wants to advocate for the thing that's most important for them. I think I'll stop there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:11] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:25:13] Thanks Vice. Just to follow-up before we get too far down another thread. I think I'll actually just respond. Caroline, I think you just noted that in this process we are just putting things on a list and how difficult this is, and yet I heard Mr. Burden and Mr. Pettinger say that they wanted to start a three-meeting process and come with a paper in April. So I guess I'll just ask Miss McKnight a quick question. Is that what you were referring to or am I totally lost here on what was being proposed?

Pete Hassemer [00:25:49] Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:25:50] I may have misunderstood Mr. Burden, but what I heard was he was going to explore whether or not that could happen in April, not a guarantee that it would kick-off a three-meeting process, which is what I was referring to. But if I was wrong, please Mr. Burden correct me.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:06] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:26:09] Yeah, thank you. What I was trying to convey is that let's look to April as a place where we can have a clear-eyed discussion about what's possible. And if that is the first of a three-meeting process, great. And if we get to April and we decide none of this is possible or none of this is what we want to do, then that's not the start of a three-meeting process, but it can be if we want to continue on after April. I'm not sure if that makes it more confusing or not, but that's what was going through my mind.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:45] Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:26:47] Thank you very much Mr. Vice-Chair. I really appreciate Miss McKnight's point that there are some things that are going to happen already. So as we're looking at the top, top, top priorities, which ones are going to happen already and what process and how soon would that yield a result? And also, are there any in the top, top priorities where we have, I hate to say it, an easy fix, a quick fix, where it's a framework rather than an amendment or if it's even a tweak within the existing regulations? I really don't have a sense of that. Is every single one just extremely costly in terms of people's time and process? So it'd be good to think about that at some point. Thank you Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:27] Thank you. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:36] Well these topics have been on the agenda plenty of times in the past, and I can say 17', something like that, we actually, the stock assessments were in such good shape people thought we didn't need them. And here we are back again. So it's nothing new. The rigidity of the system we have is killing businesses. It's killing communities. National Marine Fisheries Service did a tour of staff last year from Bodega Bay to Coos Bay and I'll tell you what when I saw, we had lunch in Brookings in one of the local places, an individual who used to work for me and I tell you they were shell-shocked in my mind, because it's one thing for us to saying how bad things are and it's the same, people saying the same thing, and you know that when you actually see it with your own eyes. You know we have a chance to.....I'm not saying we're going to, but we need to start and look at it. If we don't do that, I mean what are we even doing here? It's not a big ask. But what's on the line right now on the West Coast is, it's not pretty and it's going to get ugly and hopefully we'll just try to minimize the damage the best we can in a timely manner. That's all we're asking to do here. And realistically the inflexibility of the system is almost untenable at times and it creates all this rift between states, between sectors. We don't have to do that if we do it right. And to think of any...go in any other direction in my mind is just come on. So we're not asking for the world, we're just asking for a first step to look and see what's possible. If nothing's possible then I would just say frankly we're screwed. Anyway, I just think it's a small ask and let's look at the ball rolling. Let's have staff look at it, come back to us and we can make an informed decision on what the best path forward is for our coastal communities.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:51] I have Aja Szumylo, then Christa Svensson, and Corey Ridings. I'll try and remember the order there. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:30:02] Thank you Vice-Chair. I agree with everything that Brad just said. And I think our job here is to listen when people say they need help and really try to help, and this is something that they're all asking for in the same way in a single voice, which is rare for such a fractured group of fish.....not that they are fractured, but they have disparate business models. And

so like as government as this group as a governing group, when we get calls for help I feel like it's our job to try to be nimble and responsive. And yeah, and if we can't do that then we're failing. I think if we're prioritizing things that they don't need then yeah, what are we here for? Why are we doing this? I can't think of a case in my time working on groundfish where they've all come forward and said, help us please with this one direction. And I think that that's impressive and significant and we should hear it.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:08] Thank you. Christa Svensson, then Corey Ridings, then Heather Hall. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:31:15] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I guess I will start this out with, I like kind of the bundling together. you know when I first had this lobbed across my computer I'm looking at it going, holy smokes we've got all of these new topics that we're trying to lump into maybe one space depending on time in terms of the priority list, meaning we will hopefully get one or two things off each year. It's really why I was asking about, hey, how heavy is the lift? Not how important is this or could you pick your own, which child you'd like for the GAP because everybody has their priorities. We come to this every time whether it was omnibus, whether it is now this prioritization, this process is always painful. But I am appreciative of having everybody come together in the GAP having the testimony that was consistent between commercial and rec people here today to talk about it. I will speak a little bit to the urgency. I know for groundfish folks I'm the HMS lady and I'm okay with that because I kind of am the HMS lady, but when groundfish people start calling me talking about the urgency before a Council meeting about these set of issues, that does weigh on me in terms of the level of urgency. I am in alignment, it sounds like, with my colleagues from California in terms of prioritizing the list today. I am less enthusiastic, I guess I would say, about making a commitment on putting this on the IRA funding simply because that is a brand new idea to me as of this evening and workload planning is two days from now which would give me a chance to kind of consult with some people that are not groundfish people that could potentially be impacted for IRA funding and how we had originally structured that. And I won't speak for others, but there may be other Council members that would like that opportunity as well. So from my perspective, it would be better to kind of separate those two items, but I do think that we have consistently heard from people throughout this week of the urgency on this, and that really is the intention of prioritizing our workload. Things become more or less important over time, and from the face of it this year it appears that this is something that could help us both in the short term urgently and longer term in terms of decision-making by giving us a bit more flexibility.

Pete Hassemer [00:34:33] All right, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:34:36] Thanks Vice. Pardon me. I want to be really clear here that in terms of at least talking about what I think we're talking about, which are the four new items that the GAP proposed and we heard a lot from our public about how important those were, I am supportive of all of that work and I very clearly recognize the need as I've heard people talking about that. This week and before this week a lot of these themes have been coming up at the Council and around anybody who thinks about fisheries for awhile. In fact, I actually have concerns that are deeper than what the GAP has presented. And I have some deep fears I'm going to air right now that this is a little bit of deck chairs on the Titanic. And I really hope I'm wrong about that, or I hope I'm wrong about the distance we are from the iceberg, but I want to share that so folks know that this, what I'm talking about here and airing concerns about the process here is not that I don't agree with

that work that it should be done at some point, maybe it should be done very soon, or that it doesn't have importance. I think that it does. I want to talk a little bit about where some of that IRA funding came from and the work that this Council did to get there. It came from climate change. I know we're not supposed to say that word anymore, but I'm going to say it, because when I hear Mr. Pettinger talk about change and the things that are infecting are...affecting, impacting our fisheries, it's a big deal whether we can use that word or not. And it also falls into other categories of things like social change. We are living in a time of extreme social change, things like COVID. That was something none of us could have predicted and it had tremendous impacts on our fisheries and our fishing communities. We've also had lots of economic change. I hear a lot about the fact that fishermen are not getting very much money at the dock for their fish. That there's the same prices they got 20 years ago and that's a big problem. A lot of the work that this Council has done around ecosystem, including thinking about climate change, was to work and look and address and understand these factors. So to say that it's not important or it doesn't help our fisheries I think is a misnomer and is misunderstanding the good work that a lot of that can and has done. Along those lines, we have very little social data that goes into the Council process and what I would argue are incomplete economics. If I was queen I would ask for a lot more of that as part of this process so we could understand at a deeper level the impacts of our decisions here and what that means for people who fish in fishing communities. Finally, I'm just saying my concerns here are largely what Miss Svensson just talked about, which they are procedural. This Council uses procedure and process to respect its public, maintain its transparency, and make sure that we include as many viewpoints as possible. So what I'm trying to get my head around here and what I was speaking to earlier was that this seems a little bit out of procedure and what we're here to do under this agenda item and it's not speaking at all against not adding those four items to the list or discussing them or figuring out where they could go as future work that the Council does, but I would like to see that done under workload planning as opposed to this item that is specifically a list of prioritized items for groundfish.

Pete Hassemer [00:38:19] Thank you. Heather Hall, then Aja. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:00:00] Thank you Vice-Chair. I appreciate the comments and I appreciate your input Miss Ridings, but I'm feeling a little bit differently and was just going to speak very briefly in support of the idea to look at them, look at these agenda items under the IRA item. If it works, great. If it doesn't, it doesn't. I think we give it a shot. I think we give it the opportunity to look at an informational report in April. I did have one question, and I apologize if it was said and I missed it, but would we be expecting advisory bodies and management teams to comment on the informational report? Or is that the point of an informational report that it doesn't require input? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:58] I'm going to ask Executive Director Burden to respond to that one.

Merrick Burden [00:01:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and I might ask Todd for some help here too. But we have planned, I believe we've already even filed meeting notices for our groundfish advisory groups to meet online ahead of the Council meeting. So we're still trying to hold back from travel. And so if the timing works out to get something together in time for them to consider as part of that webinar, you could expect a report from them at that time, but Todd I'll look to you and see if you want to add anything more.

Todd Phillips [00:01:41] Yes, through the Vice-Chair, so both the GAP and the GMT have a single webinar scheduled I believe on April 4th, the GAP is four hours, the GMT also has four hours. Those webinars were initially designed to discuss and prepare reports at least for the research and data needs, and there was another item in there that I can't quite recall at this point. So there is, you know, call it a three and a half hour opportunity for them to discuss when you take out all the other procedures.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:18] Thank you. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:02:22] And I am told that we do have a workload capacity issue all of the sudden and that making that timing work is fairly unlikely. So I think what we'd be looking for is producing your report that would help you all. We would be inviting the public to comment, help you all be clear-eyed about what it is we're looking at. But the timing is such that a report that we would put together for April would be almost certainly supplemental, and I don't know that that lines up with the schedule that Todd just mentioned.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:59] Heather, a follow-up?

Heather Hall [00:03:01] Thank you, I appreciate that. I support that. I support being clear with our Groundfish Management Team, our advisory bodies that we're not expecting them to comment. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:14] Thank you. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:03:16] Thank you. I just wanted to add something conceptually to this entire discussion too. My view of those items, items D1 to D4 in the GAP Report are that they are tools that we can use in certain circumstances. I don't view them as like things that we're going to apply to every single stock, all the 90 whatever stocks that are in the groundfish FMP. I don't think that we're going to be able to in every case. I think we're going to have a lot of rules that end up precluding us from using them in a lot of places. But if we do not create the tool we'll never be able to use it. And if we stop looking to create the tool because there are....because it doesn't work for everything and because it's not perfect for every situation, then we're never going to be able to offer flexibility when the time comes up that we need to offer the flexibility. And so to me, and I want to track back to something Corey said, I'm with you, climate change is a thing and it's happening even though we're not supposed to talk about it anymore, but I think the way that we make ourselves able to deal with changing environments is that we create tools that allow us to be flexible. And if we don't create the tools that allow for flexibility then we can never respond. We're always going to be in reactive mode if we're not, if we don't step back and do something proactive about things. And in my view, I'm not viewing us using this in every circumstance. I'm viewing us using like....we may even in this and I envisioned in this case that we might think about, you know, do any of these things in particular right now apply to shortspine and canary? And then we might leave them alone for everything else for a long time until the next opportunity comes up. But I think some of the past times that we've considered things of this scale and scope, we've tried to like look at the whole table of groundfish and consider whether carryover worked, and folks who are on the GMT before can certainly confirm the approach that was used in the past, but I think that we've done it in massive ways rather than focusing on the procedural, the procedural simplicity of adding a tool to the FMP that can be employed in certain circumstances when it is necessary. So I just want to contrast that like, I know that this could be a lot of.....if you take it from the view

of like doing this for every single stock it could be a bazillion hours of work and terrible, but if we....I know all kinds of actions that have happened across the country that are simply adding tools that can be used in other circumstances, and that might be what we do and how we approach it here. And I'm happy to like help point to those other situations where we've taken complex concepts and included them as options in a really simplistic way. So I'll stop there. I just wanted to frame that like this doesn't, we also....there is a world where this doesn't have to be as scary and monumental as people think it could be.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:13] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:06:17] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I would like to see if I can help you all kind of pull this discussion back together. I do think the discussion has been really good. I think we are mixing up a few things that we don't need to be mixing up as part of this agenda item. I think Miss Ridings just spoke to this a minute ago. Your task here is to identify priorities, and we have questions about our fiscal outlook now and I think we're grasping to say is that can we bridge that with IRA money maybe something else will happen. We don't have to have that conversation now. So what I think would be easier and more helpful to move forward is to really refocus on the task here, which is what are the priorities that you would like us to advance? And then I can work with my staff and we can bring something back to help that continue to move forward. And so Mr. Pettinger spoke to essentially support for the GAP recommendations and if that's what you would like we can bring back a little bit more to help you figure out how to focus and move forward with that. I don't think we have to have the IRA discussion here.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:31] Lynn Mattes, then Caroline McKnight.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:33] Thank you Vice-Chair and I appreciate kind of getting us back on track. We've been focused on what's D1 through 4 in the GAP Report because of how it was brought up, but the GAP also recommended combining B2 and B4 and prioritizing those. Acknowledging the great work that the GAP did to come up with these recommendations as a group, what are we going to, what is the thinking on B2 and B4 since they also said those would be a priority? Admittedly those only help the trawl sector while D1 through D4 have the potential to help all the sectors so maybe there's some, a Little bit more of a priority there but I just want, don't want us to lose sight of those other recommendations from the GAP Report.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:32] Caroline, then Aja. Trying to be fair twisting my head back and forth here.

Caroline McKnight [00:08:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Lynn. You dovetailed sort of where I was headed, which was that there are some other things I think that are worthy of some discussion, and there are some easy things that I think we could discuss, such as combined recommendations to remove a few things from the list. And I think that there's some places to talk about where there's some things to put on the B-list potentially. And then others where I've already mentioned that we maybe can forgo and leave for now and pick back up later. So relative to B2 and B4, I will note that there is a NMFS Report that is suggesting that those are ready for prime time as early as November. Well I shouldn't say early, that's a ways away. But that's not immediate, that's not April, that's not June, it's not September, that still provides an outlook. I am comfortable with that recommendation, not just because it was the GAP and GMT supported, but because we have spent many of hours in this Council discussing when is there enough data to move EFPs into

regulation and we're there, we're hearing a signal from NMFS that it's there. So I think that is fair and worthy to put forward on the list. I think I'll stop there.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:10] Aja I think your hand was up? I'm not sure.

Aja Szumylo [00:10:13] Thank you Vice-Chair. It was but let's keep going.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:23] All right. Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:10:24] I don't want to cut discussion short, but given the comments I just made, I'm prepared with a motion to maybe stimulate some more discussion and see where this goes.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:35] Let's stimulate some more discussion and see it.

Caroline McKnight [00:10:44] If you wouldn't mind making that a little bit bigger for my eyes. Thank you. I move the Council make the following changes to the GMT work management measure list from Agenda Item H.8.a, GMT Supplemental Report 2, March 2025. Number 1: Remove the following items from the list in Agenda Item H.8.a, GMT Supplemental Report 2, March 2025. B1: Clarifying Catch Accounting Rules for Amendment 21. And B5: Carryover When Management Units Change. Number 2: Add the following items to the A-list and prioritize from Agenda Item H.8.a, GMT Supplemental Report 2, March 2025. B2: Removal of Selective Flatfish Trawl Requirement between 40° 10' and 42° north latitude. And B4: Remove Certain Time and Area Management Restrictions for Midwater Trawl Gear Targeting Non-Whiting. And Number 3: Add the following to the non-prioritized B-list from Agenda Item H.8.a, Supplemental GMT Report 2, March 2025. C1: Rockfish Sorting Requirements.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:58] Thank you. I followed along. What was on the screen appears accurate and complete, do you agree?

Caroline McKnight [00:12:06] It does.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:07] Thank you, is there a second to your motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak to your motion.

Caroline McKnight [00:12:16] Thank you. I think B1 and B5 to remove from the list was recommended by both the GMT and GAP, and I think it's pretty straightforward. We're going to pull something off the list if it's done and that's what B1 is. B5, I was moved by the GMT Report that noted that we are through stock definitions now for a majority of some species that we assess regularly, and so changes in management unit is unlikely to be a problem and so that item is really no longer needed. In terms of adding B2 and B4 to the A-list and being prioritized, I just mentioned that we have this very strong signal from NMFS that we have enough data and that the BiOp is coming in November. I'll reiterate again that my intent here is not to say that it needs to be on the YAG immediately, but that it is prioritized and ready to go at least towards the end of this year. And it was also recommended by the GAP and GMT to be put forward. And then lastly, I am adding to the non-prioritized list the C1, the Rockfish Sorting Requirements. This is here because I recall a conversation we had during the close up business of last specifications where we had some priority discussions going about our next cycle of stock assessments and we had some sorting

requirement issues for certain slope species. This one sitting on the list for me is just signaling two things. One, it's always better when we've got more sorting requirements in place for our stock assessment and our data streams. But two, this runs in tandem with our stock definition work, and then when that's completed we can bring this up and then evaluate it to the appropriate species that either are or not in the FMP as appropriate. That's it, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:18] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? I'm not seeing any questions. Discussion on the motion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:14:36] Thank you Vice-Chair. Thank you for the motion Caroline. I appreciate you putting this all together and going through the GMT and the GAP recommendations and providing this motion for us to think about, I'll be supporting the motion. I really appreciate you including the rockfish sorting requirements and that we have brought that up as a WDFW Report and so appreciate having that on the list. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:10] Any other discussion? Seeing no discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:15:20] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:20] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Caroline. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:15:39] Thank you Vice-Chair. If everyone is ready I have another motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:44] Let's hear it, please.

Aja Szumylo [00:15:51] Okay. I move that the Council prioritize, so that's adding to Table A, Items D1, D2, D3, and D4 in Table D in the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Report, Agenda Item H.8.a. And add Item D7 in Table D in the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Report, Agenda Item H.8.a to table B.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:17] Thank you. I followed along. The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Aja Szumylo [00:16:22] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:23] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Heather Hall? Please speak to your motion.

Aja Szumylo [00:16:29] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'll start with Item D7. So this is the Season Start Date for the Primary Tier Fishery. And again, I'm adding this one to table B, so the non-prioritized list. The GAP Report noted that the change in the start date would expand fishing opportunity throughout the entire calendar year. And I also appreciated the GAP's note that the additional calendar year flexibility could support fishermen fishing at times of year that could reduce interactions with fixed gear and whales. For items D1 to D4 in the GAP Report, we've had a lot of discussion here tonight about those items and I'll still drag home since I'm doing motion justification, calling everyone back to comments from Mr. Ripka, Mr. Lackey, Miss Diamond,

their remarks under open public comment, all the discussion under the whiting agenda item if you guys remember that one, and the remarks from industry during this agenda item. Throughout those discussions you heard this need for immediate flexibility around a few constraining species this year, but I see a lot of potential for these items to be helpful in other situations in the future. I'll highlight again that the comments were from all sectors, and that's, again, incredible and I think a really big indication of it being something that we should get behind too. This is one of the few, or the set of ideas are one of the few that if we add them to the FMP they have potential to support every sector and have the potential also to support, if we consider them in the right way, some of the other FMPs that the Council manages. I wanted to note that in addition to Sarah's callout of National Standards 1 and 8, I'll add that this is in line with National Standard 6, which is a little used National Standard but I like that one, it's Variations and Contingencies. So that one states that a regime, a management regime must be flexible enough to allow timely response to resource industry and other national and regional needs. So it's a helpful one here for thinking about us being responsive as a Council body to the needs of industry. As we said, all throughout this discussion these ideas have been explored to varying degrees in the past but they weren't finished in favor of more pressing items or due to complexity or other reasons. I know that that work is unfinished but it still exists in the record and that previous work could really help jump start and move the analysis for this along for whenever we're able to pull it together. I know that there are resource concerns that may constrain it but we do need to get started. I also want to note also that it's important to consider these measures together. One thing that stood out to me was Miss Nayani's response to Rebecca Lent earlier, the discussion about the potential for carryover to work in concert with multi-year specifications. And I think for that reason we need to look at these things as a group rather than looking at them individually just to see how the concert could help address some of the concerns that we've had when we looked at them alone. I support Mr. Pettinger's suggestion to move these forward as soon as possible as part of the flexibility and adaptive management agenda item. I'm committed to working over the next couple of days to convince all of you around the Council table that this fits there, that this is exactly in line with that work. And I will go back and read it tonight and come back and talk to all of you guys later on. And then I'm really interested to hear along with what I was saying earlier whether looking at these items in, again, in an action that takes however long and in whatever shape, can be accompanied by a concerted look at shortspine and canary and the flexibilities it provides around those species in particular. And yeah, my idea there is like maybe we don't implement all these things for all of the species in the FMP, but maybe we take care to use those two species as examples and use them as test cases right now since they're the points of most pain for industry. And so with that I conclude comments.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:57] Thank you. Questions for clarification? Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:21:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you Miss Szumylo for that proposal. I was concerned that we're putting stuff in the A-list and these were still here. That being said, it's getting really crowded in the A-list and I wonder if it's possible to maybe either look at the A-list if everything's in there and stack them up, or out of these four look at which ones might move faster and move that to the top. I just this is the hardest thing to do and figure out what are your priorities on your priority list but you can't have everything. So what would be, I'm just thinking about something that would be less resource intense in terms of moving it forward, and that's where it's so good to think about things that are already in the pipeline and get those there so they get completed. So any thoughts on prioritizing our priorities would be welcome. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:58] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:21:58] Thank you Vice-Chair. I do want to add during questions on the GAP Report, I did ask the GAP about the trawl gear EFP and then the selective flat, I didn't ask about selective flatfish gear, but my impression from their response there and the energy that you heard them speak about items D1 through D4 about is that they would be willing to, and I welcome any of them countering any of this, but that they'd be willing to forego some of those items and the speed of those items for considering this larger flexibility that would be applicable to everyone.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:35] Thank you. Other questions for clarification on the motion? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:22:48] Thank you Vice-Chair, and thank you for the motion and the language around it. We've had some very robust discussion. Part of our job is to ask questions, to gather information, and just because we're asking questions doesn't mean we're not supportive of things, but it's trying to find out information to make informed decisions. Still maybe have a little discomfort about the process and how this is going forward, but that's a process issue. This going, moving this forward, I will be supportive of it. Under the next agenda, the next groundfish agenda item I'm going to be asking to make reductions to something in the Oregon recreational fishery because of canary issues. We have canary issues too and it's going to pretty much eliminate a fishery where I personally have worked on my entire career at ODFW to get going. So these actions will help all sectors, especially when we're looking at something like canary. Like I said, still some discomfort about moving to these IRA funding since that's not how this was, that was originally approached and not everybody who's involved in that process, but we do need to move forward on things to try to solve problems. Try to....I think Mr. Niles and I brought it up a little bit under the stock definitions, things that we can do to try to help our fisheries and our fisheries communities. So it's a long way of saying I'll be supportive and also teeing up my report for the next agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:37] Thank you. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:24:38] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Aja for the motion. I will be supporting it. And I just want to come back and comment that we've had some public officials here from Northern California asking why after 18 months we can't get any relief over quillback because the process is long and it's hard to understand and it's difficult to navigate. And so the options here in D1 through D4 give us an opportunity to evaluate and consider how we can reduce that time so that it isn't years that people feel like they're shut down and shut out of fishing opportunities, but something much less than that, and that makes a difference. And so I'm not going to worry about when and how this might get done eminently, sorry Mr. Burden. That's going to be your burden literally to carry. But I think that the GAP has put forward a united voice and they have put forward some really great things that we could consider that could help us in the long run and that's that's always worth our time. So, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:55] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:25:57] Thank you Vice-Chair. Very similar input and thoughts on this too, particularly where we were last fall, I guess, in understanding the issues in the GAP and the real

struggle they were having and thinking about canary. And it was feeling like they were battling each other and that's never good. And this just supports what you just said Miss McKnight about this comes together, this is a package that addresses all sectors and gives everyone an opportunity to maybe breathe a little bit under a lot of pressure, and so I'm supportive of it. I also wanted to note too, and being very, seeing this silver lining may be overly optimistic here, but I'd also note that we have a lot of progress on the items that are in Table A right now. So we just adopted a PPA for LEFG, we did Cordell Bank, and those are moving forward. And so I see a little bit of relief of workload there, and I know, again, I know we have a tendency, we're hard workers and we care about what we do and we tend to overload ourselves, but just noting there might be a little bit of a relief valve as some of these other agenda item A things get completed. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:24] Thank you. Other discussion? Looking around. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:37] Yeah, just to thank Aja for the motion. And you know it's the first step. I think that if we could get some of these things through we could have the...get the real flexibility we've been desiring for years and it's going to make this job easier for everybody. It'll pay off for every sector down the road. I think just a... I think that just the importance of that stands by itself as why it shouldn't be here. Because everybody, every port is wanting it, every fisherman is wanting this, and they need it. And I won't say we're going to get it, but at least it's in the queue and you've got to take the first step, and this is the first step. Let's go from there and see what we got. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:30] Thank you. Last look around for hands. Any more discussion? Not seeing any hands I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:28:37] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:37] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Aja. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:28:56] Thank you. I know it's getting late. I'll try to keep this brief, but I do have another motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:04] Let's see it there.

Heather Hall [00:29:10] I move the Council make the following changes to the GMT Workload and New Management Measures List from Agenda Item H.8.a, GMT Supplemental Report 2, March 2025 as follows: Add to the A-list and prioritize B8, Commercial Sale of Recreational Fish Waste, and prioritize.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:37] Thank you. The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Heather Hall [00:29:41] I do.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:42] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Butch Smith. Please speak your motion.

Heather Hall [00:29:48] Thank you. This, I'll just say right up front, I acknowledge I'm adding something to the Table A, but this has been on the B-list for a long time. It's an issue in Washington and particularly in Westport that we cannot resolve on our own with this federal rule in place. And so the federal rule says you can't sell recreational or sport caught fish. We're having issues with fish waste and being able to manage that. So this is a deregulatory request. It's a low workload according to the GMT because what in essence it does is then takes the federal rule for what is happening in a port or a state out of the federal rule and then applies the responsibility for how that works to the states. So it gives the states the ability to manage those landings in a way that helps us. So it may fit in another package. I'm not sure if it might fit in spex as a recreational measure. So I'm not suggesting that it come back up with the other items that were just passed in the last motion, but I would like to add it to the prioritized list. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:22] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? See no questions, discussion on the motion? Not seeing any discussion. Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:38] Well I know that my port in Brookings is....I think every port suffers with this, right? And so it costs people money and obviously we understand that funding is a big issue across the board and I would support this given it is a low workload. I would assume it would be fairly simple to do you would think. So anyway.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:05] Thank you. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:32:13] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:15] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Heather. As we have some silence here for a second I'll ask for our task list to be put up. I don't want to shut off any other additional motions, but when we see the task list I will ask Todd to look that over. Todd, which one did we miss?

Todd Phillips [00:32:55] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You, well the Council has not discussed the Item 2, which is to Consider the Best Practices Document. However, looking at Items 1, 3, and 4, you've had considerable discussion on it so you've addressed those, so I'd be Number 2.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:19] Any comments, thoughts on the remaining task there, the draft best practices document? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:33:33] Thank you Vice-Chair. I don't know if this needs a formal motion since it says consider and provide guidance. I think it's a good start and a good place so we can all look at things to know what we're trying to do here in the order we're trying to do things. So I think it's in a good place and would consider we use it moving forward knowing that there's always, we can always re-examine if we find errors going forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:34:05] Thank you Lynn. Any other guidance? People agree with that? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:34:10] Thank you Vice-Chair, and thank you Todd for putting together this document. I was around when this, yeah we'll use torturous again as the word today, process

started, and it's nice to have some of these confusing processes wrapped up well in one place. I'll admit I have to look at it closer, and yeah, as long as, yeah, as Lynn said, as long as it's open to for refinement as we go along and find out new ways to describe things better, then I think that we can start using it as guidance going forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:34:43] All right, I've heard guidance to continue moving forward on that. I'm not seeing any other comments or guidance on that so Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:34:56] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So in conclusion, looking at your task here I would say you've completed all of them. And just in highest level summary, you have added 7 items to the list for prioritization which would make a total of 8, including Phase 2, noting that two items, the LEFG is going to be likely completed in June, and Cordell was completed at this meeting. And then you've also added and have moved and subtracted items from List B. So I would say Mr. Vice-Chair you have completed this item appropriately.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:34] All right. Before we close it out, let me look around see if there's any additional comments or discussion on the agenda item? I don't see any so we'll close this out. Thank you all for your work and I will pass the gavel back to our Chair.

9. Inseason Adjustments – Final

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes the public comment and takes us to Council discussion and action, and it's on the screen before us. Consider Projections for the 2025 Fisheries and any Inseason Adjustments as Necessary. who wants to start the discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:26] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I'll have a motion for this when we get to that point. But as I alluded to in some of our discussions yesterday afternoon, canary is an issue with the Oregon recreational fishery, particularly the longleader gear fishery. To try to reduce the need for going to complete non-retention of canary through state processes, we've reduced the bag limit in the longleader gear fishery, the sub-bag limit. We have been informed by a lot of people that going to a one fish sub-bag with canary has the potential to change a lot of behavior with this fishery. It may not be worth it for people to go. We've been told there's going to be a lot of red fish floating around. They do their best to avoid the canary, but canary like to hang out with the yellowtails. This is one of those things I feel like I have some ownership over. My first GMT statement in September of 2008 was a statement on the EFP to start testing this gear with help from Mr. Niles and Mr. Budrick, who's now on the SSC. We've been using this fishery, promoting it, and really trying to get people involved in it as a relief valve to take pressure off of our more nearshore stocks. We're also going to be very close on our black rockfish, which is a more nearshore species. So Mr. Heath, who gave the report a few minutes ago, he's given a presentation called, "Between a Rockfish and a Hard Place", which is where our fishery is, between the canary and the black rockfish. It's not ideal but we feel we need to take this action to be precautionary. And I know the GMT Report shows projected impacts are still higher than what our ACL is, or our share of the ACL is. We will be monitoring inseason both the longleader and the regular bottomfish fishery and we will be taking action if and when it becomes necessary. We just don't know what this one fish sub-bag for canary is going to do to effort in this fishery. So there's some uncertainty, but we will be tracking it closely like we do with our other fisheries and our other species. And I have a motion for that when it comes time. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:35] Thank you Lynn. Before we get to that, let me look and see if there's other discussion. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:02:42] Just a couple quick thoughts that come to mind in hearing our, that last exchange Marci and public testimony and what Lynn just said there, I'm thinking of the stock definitions discussion we're having and this is where you really see kind of the things I express some concern about. This is, you know, we often hear our regulations are complicated and you're really hoping that the quillback assessment comes out and shows it was a false alarm. I'm just.....these are complicated things. I know the state of California has done a lot to make the quillback quotas work. But if we really do a stronger break between state and federal management, do these issues get more complicated and worse is the thought? And Lynn, there's connections to what Lynn is saying too, between the dynamic of managing a fishery, between a.... I missed the clever title exactly, but that sums it up. I mean there's connections in these fisheries between state and federal waters and some of what we spoke to of concerns yesterday. And second, Mr. Vice-Chair you're drawing our attention to the Chinook salmon scorecard. Made me think back to our discussion about at-sea set-asides and the thought that we often focus on the negative because that's where we need to maybe more attention, but looking at that scorecard I want to note that you look at how well they've avoided Chinook last year and we don't see the mothership sector because of

the confidentiality issue, but we know they worked to waive that and we'll see those numbers. And they also did really well against those thresholds. So they do work hard to avoid all these species, and so I felt like just maybe drawing attention to the positive here, remind us that they do perform well on a lot of the times.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:56] Thank you Corey. And maybe I'll add to that too, typically I do notice that also, the efforts made. We have what looks like a high number, the allowance there, but the actual, the realized impacts are very low because of the efforts they take so applaud those sectors for doing that. Other discussion here? I Know we have a motion. Let's go ahead and see that Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:05:32] Thank you Vice-Chair. I really appreciate Mr. Phillips and Miss Kent reviewing this motion carefully to make sure I didn't mess anything up. So I move the Council adopt the decrease in the sub-bag limit for canary rockfish from five fish to one fish in the longleader gear fishery as recommended by ODFW and the GMT.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:00] Okay, the language on the screen appears accurate and complete and you have the citations in there. Do you agree?

Lynn Mattes [00:06:08] Yes sir. It does look complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:10] Thank you. Look for a second? Seconded by Virgil Moore. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:16] Thank you Vice-Chair. I think I spoke to it enough a few minutes ago, but if there's further questions I'd be happy to answer them.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:24] All right, I'll look around and see if there are any questions for clarification? Not seeing any questions, any discussion on the motion? and there's no discussion so let's call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:06:40] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:43] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. Based on what we've seen in the reports I'm thinking that we have completed our work. I'll let you think about that and ask Todd Phillips if there's more to be done here?

Todd Phillips [00:07:07] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, you have heard from all the report writers, so the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the GMT. You've had some public comment and consider projections as well as adopted some inseason adjust.....and an inseason adjustment. I would say based on that you have accomplished your tasks here today.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:29] All right, thank you Todd. I'll look around and see if there are any more comments here? And I'm not seeing any so I will close out this agenda item and pass the gavel back to our Chair.

I. Highly Migratory Species Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

No transcription for this agenda item.

2. International Management Activities

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] That takes care of reports. There's no public comment so that takes us to Council action, which is to provide some recommendations as appropriate. With that I'll open the floor for discussion. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:29] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks everyone. There's a lot there, but just going back to I think one of the first things Christa said regarding, again that was repeated here in our last discussions about international treaties and negotiations. I think it's not unusual to have some pauses and changes when we change administrations at the federal level. However, I think it is somewhat different this go-round and I just want to highlight that at least I feel, and I believe the Council feels that that negotiation with Canada is vital to the United States. It's vital to the economics of the United States and the viability of small businesses in the United States, which are fisheries. And just about every single fishermen out there is a small business and so I really do hope that that proceeds and importantly, I think as Mike has mentioned, that some of the engagement with stakeholders can move forward even while we are waiting for the formal negotiations. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:47] Thank you John. Okay. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:01:51] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you for the comments coming from the state of California. I am completely in alignment with that, and I just want to recognize not only the economic hardship piece, which this treaty does help alleviate, particularly when it's timely and people can make those business decisions that they need to, but just also comment on the fact that by the definition every single one of the albacore HMS members is a small business based on vessel size, et cetera. So it is a significant fleet. We have had over, I don't know what the numbers are this year, but we've had well over 300 participants annually. Many years it's up to 600 plus depending on how close the fish are to shore. So it's not a small number of businesses that are potentially impacted by these types of negotiations. And I'm appreciative of the time to talk about it this morning.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:08] Thank you Christa. All right, anyone else? All right, Kerry how are we doing here?

Kerry Griffin [00:03:17] Thank you Mr. Chair. Well, if there's no more Council discussion or guidance, I think that concludes your business for this agenda item.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:24] All right. Well with that, thank you. We're going to take a 10-minute break.

3. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, the public comment, and takes us to our Council discussion and action. The task list is making its way onto our screen, and there it is. Review the Roadmap, Provide Guidance, and Next Steps as Necessary, and the guidance on next steps developing an EFP framework. So with that slight stall, I'll look for the first hand to initiate discussion. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:39] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. And I think the team's report, the five recommendations they make give us a good starting point for our discussion. I do think there's some additional discussion to meet our tasks to sort of send the FIW off with what's next. But in looking at the five items, and I think I have some comments on all of them, but I just want to start with their third item, removing Climate-Ready Fisheries both from the action items and from the definition. As you'll recall, that definition of Climate-Ready Fisheries was something that we discussed at some length on the floor and very intentionally added. And I also see that the team has struck the word "climate change" from Action Item 1, F1 and 2 I think it is. And you know I'll just say that the state of California believes climate change is real. That this word and wording is part and parcel to the Roadmap and to the funding that we received to move forward with the Roadmap. And while the edit is okay, it still achieves that. In terms of removing the word climate change, I wouldn't fight strongly against that, but the climate-ready fisheries part I think is something we really wanted in there and so I think not necessarily deciding on final wording today, because I don't want to wordsmith this today, but I think I'd like to hear what the rest of the Council feels about that.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:44] Thank you John. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:47] Thanks Vice-Chair, and thank you John for those comments. I agree with you, I believe climate change is real as well, but I also know from my experience working in government and the current climate that we're in, not climate change climate, but situation climate that we're in, there's hostility and I want to protect the Council and I want to protect the good work that we do. And I don't think we lose.....you know I think provided that we keep wording in that attends to the spirit of what we're trying to do to deal with variability, to deal with all of that, I think to the degree that we can avoid putting a target on our backs about things and keep the good work that we're doing going forward, I would rather, I'd rather be protective of our initiatives than insistent on using inflammatory wording at the moment. So that's, I mean that's where I sit. I support removing the words as long as, as long as we can like use fake words that get at the intent of all of this in other ways. And I hear what Theresa was saying as well. I think there's a lot of discussion in the climate-ready fisheries documents that we could use to expand the discussion if the intent isn't there. But I know from my time in NOAA that, yeah, I worked a lot on the climate-ready nation work and I think you all see how assaulted that work is at the moment. And I just....because of our discussion yesterday as we were talking about the specifications flexibility and tying it to the other flexibility IRA project, I went back and looked at that and we do say climate a bunch of times there, but I don't think we should stop this good work. And I think we need to, yeah, be strategic about protecting the work even if, even if we're removing words that we believe in at the moment. And I hope that times will change and that we can say the words again that describe reality, but I'd rather not lose the work.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:02] Thank you. Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:05:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, whether it's too much blue sky, I don't know what you want to rename it, but if we get to the goal that we need to get at and we do the things that we need to do at this Council, omitting a few words to get to that end is certainly worth the reward at the end. And I support the same, Vice, removing those words. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:40] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:05:41] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks for all those comments. This is difficult because words matter in some cases for the good and for the not so good. But I just want to mention that I recall that one of the reasons climate was taken out, or climate-ready, is because some folks in the fishery and processing sector felt there were other things that are part of being resilient, it could be the markets, it could be bycatch, it could be a bunch of other things, so the resilience is more than just short-term and long-term weather and climate. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:20] John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:06:20] Yeah, thanks. And thanks Rebecca for that, and Aja. I, again, I think the term "climate change" could be triggering and I see that removing that might, as you say, protect the Council, though I honestly don't think the Council should feel that we have to be protected. If the funding for this particular project is ripped away because we recognize reality then so be it, and we don't complete this project and we will not be harmed. We won't have as much to go off of for our HMS management, but we still have an FMP. Again, in terms of Climate-Ready Fisheries, that was specifically added by, I believe, motion at the Council on the floor. And so for the team to remove the definition and to remove the reference to Climate-Ready Fisheries, I think requires some very specific Council agreement around that. And so I would recommend that all of this be considered by the FIW in finalizing the Roadmap and that we come back with a recommendation on it after some detailed discussions. I don't want to adopt any of this today, nor do I think we're ready to. I think there's a lot of editing that needs to happen.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:06] Thank you. Christa Svensson, then Corey Niles. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:08:09] Yeah, just wanting to reflect for a minute on use of language, because we do talk quite often about words mattering and how we use language. And I think it's important to also acknowledge that when we have changes, whether it's changes for having new Council members, whether it's having changes in administrations, using language that people understand is important. And I will give an example, actually on the labor standards that I spoke to earlier in international. We have a number of CCMs who use the term "human rights". We have a number of CCMs that use more along the type of terminology of "rights for workers". We needed to demonstrate flexibility on how we achieved that goal based upon the language that was used, meaning others had tried to get the focus around human rights, and it was such a sticking point that conservation measures did not move forward either in our RFMO or others. Industry really made the recommendation that "labor rights" or "rights for workers" was something that they felt could possibly get us there. And so while we did not change any of the underlying, the intent was there for everybody. It did take having that conversation about what the terminology was that could get us to where we needed to be. And I think when it comes to climate and climate readiness it is

important for us to recognize that we have our own understanding and that others may have a different understanding in terms of that terminology. And I agree with Aja, I don't usually use people's first names but I'm going to go out on a limb this morning and be a little more flexible, that the work that we're doing is important on this particular topic in terms of giving people the opportunity to get on the water. And so I'm willing to be flexible in terms of not including "climate" if that is something that is going to be a distraction. I also just took a minute to look up climate definitions because I was thinking, geez, there's an awful lot of stuff I think about that has nothing to do with the environment. I think about economic climate, or social climate, or political climate. And the third definition I found really appropriate, which is the prevailing trend of public opinion or of another aspect of public life. And I, you know, that kind of gets us away from what word are we using. At this moment in time I would say that the public trend might be to not use terms like "climate-ready", but I do think that there are an awful lot of climate components that Rebecca you spoke to a moment ago in terms of what's going on in communities that we do need to be prepared for. An example that comes to mind would be COVID, where that was not necessarily environmental in terms of climate in the atmospheric sense, but it certainly changed the climate of our fisheries in terms of being prepared and how do we move forward with that. So hopefully those comments help. But I do think it's important that whatever language we choose to use moving forward, it is something that we are confident in what we're doing and that we are confident and clear in how we are communicating that with others.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:40] Thank you. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:12:44] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I just want to say I agree with John's suggestion for the way forward. Christa makes some very similar thoughts to what I was of English is a rich language. Sometimes we have great words and make up new ones that we don't need, like for example, many times this morning I'm like, could people please just say "schedule" instead of "agendize" because that's not really a word. And I'll have to say another joke, that Kerry I think F-I-W is winning over few in terms of how we pronounce that acronym. But I think the, yeah, I think the goal is we, just people, humans tend to pack a lot of concepts and try to do it into single words. Like, I can think of a lot of examples, but when we first started the FEP, the question people were throwing about are, like are humans part of the environment and as if humans existed in a different dimension or something, but ecosystem it was. So I think it's really important to get past the words and into the specific concepts. And I think the goals of this are going to be the same. That's like, yeah dude, we have a climate. The earth has always had a climate in our fisheries or and everything else is subject to the forces of that climate. So I trust that the FIW is the right place to get beyond these words and into the specifics and the goal. And I don't think the goals are going to, I think Dr. Lent spoke to it of we don't need that perfect goal to make progress. And I just, it was a long way of saying I agree with John's path forward and it was in a motion and the way to think through it thoroughly would be to have this group do it for us and bring it back.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:41] Chair Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:41] Yeah, I'm inclined to agree with Corey and John on this. I think that, you know the climate's, it's always changing, right? There's always regime shifts happen depending on what's really happening here in the bigger scheme of things we'll find out, will be determined I guess. But we need to....regardless of what is forcing that, we still need to respond to it because it affects us either way. I'm good with it being left in and just not really change anything yet because

they're going to do their work in April and let's have them come back and let's have an informed decision when that happens.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:30] Aja Szumylo. Sorry, Virgil Moore then Aja.

Virgil Moore [00:15:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. To me this is a definitional issue here that has a political component as well as a scientific component. My common understanding when I checked it is climate is a long-term average weather condition. And the timeframe that you decide that average becomes the scientific aspect of that. Our weather organization is NOAA, and given the political issues associated with terminology, I guess I would ask NOAA to provide an alternative definition or terminology for long-term average weather changes. And I don't think we can come up with that here. I think we've got to look to this administration to provide an understanding or do we just use the term? You know that the fishery is long-term average 30-year weather-ready? So I'm a little facetious here, but we've got to come up with something and we've got to look to somebody that has that connection to the administration as well as the scientific responsibilities for helping us deal with it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:10] Thank you. Ryan Wulff, a response?

Ryan Wulff [00:17:13] Not quite a response, but I'll take the bait a little bit because I think it's a good segue to make my comments. So first and foremost, I want to echo the thanks that were given the MT when they did their report, right? This was not an easy task to work with the AS to come up with a draft before us. There was a lot of work on that and I really want to congratulate them and appreciate the good head start they've given us here. Regarding the language discussion here, right? I also don't fault the MT at all. The term "Climate-Ready Fisheries" was clearly used frequently by the previous administration so I understand the intent there. And I appreciate the comments around the table. I think as far as I can take your bait Mr. Moore is the fact that we have not received any guidance at NOAA to not use the term "climate change" at this point in time, but of course I appreciate the comments that have been made around the table, and obviously you've seen this current administration's engagements and priorities as it relates to this, at least how it's been put forward in various Executive Orders or otherwise. So leaving that aside, I also wanted to concur with Mr. Ugoretz' suggestion that I think has been also pretty widely supported, which is I think all of this is ready for additional discussions in the working group. I think we can take that up there and we have a meeting scheduled for April. I'm looking forward to that and then be able to kind of come back to the Council I think with something a little bit more fleshed out as opposed to take up more floor time here. So that's at least my current views. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:10] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:19:15] I will cautiously raise my hand and move on with that to some of the other recommendations from the team. I appreciate the discussion. I don't agree with some of it, but again, it can be discussed. With their other four recommendations. Number 1, they were asking that we adopt the components of the Roadmap. I don't want to adopt today. I think more work needs to be done on it. Number 2 was provide guidance on inclusion of additional content in the Terms Appendix. And I do think that Terms Appendix should be included in the Roadmap. I think definitions, while many of those definitions may be redundant to definitions elsewhere, having them physically attached to the Roadmap helps us in the future. It provides the common understanding. It used to provide a definition of Climate-Ready Fisheries, which, by the way

matches the NOAA definition which is on their website. And the first thing that comes up in Google when you Google Climate-Ready Fisheries. And it's attached to the IRA funding that came for this project from the previous administration. So be that. Number 4 was the roles. And that's where I would like to go next in our floor discussion. In my view, this is all ready to go to the Fisheries Innovation Workgroup. I think, as Kerry read in our report, we're ready to dive into some of the details on this. I think that will help us flesh out the final Roadmap, which I think still needs some more content. I don't think it's a full Roadmap yet but it's definitely close. And I think our first meeting discussion we very all, all of us very clearly desire to get into the nuts and bolts and figure out some of these things like what was brought up by Miss Labriola in public comment about, you know, defining performance and how do we gauge performance and the questions Dr. Lent brought up regarding that. So in terms of roles, I see this as being handed to the FIW at this point. And I think the HMSMT and AS are both members on that team so they can still have a good amount of advice along with others. And then, of course, when it comes back as a report to you all you'll get advisory body comments and discussion. And then their last thing was the drift gillnet bycatch summary. I'm fine with that moving to an informational item annually. While I appreciate the comment that it might delay action by one meeting if something was going on, I see that as the case we were in prior anyway. If we receive it as a report on the floor and have discussion on the floor we're still not going to be able to take any action at that meeting that specifically changes something, so having less time allotted to it I think doesn't harm us and it achieves one of our goals to shorten our meetings a little bit so I'm okay with that. And with that, I'll pass it on to others.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:56] Thank you John. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:23:01] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks John for lining all of that out. I am supportive of that path and approach and appreciate the articulation and mindfulness about all of them.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:20] Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:23:22] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I share that appreciation for that clarification. I guess what I am hearing, and maybe Miss Gilly can help us on this, is that the funding in IRA Project Number 3 is funding for the FIW. Is that what I understood? Or maybe I misunderstood. Thank you.

Gilly Lyons [00:23:47] Through the Vice-Chair, thank you Dr. Lent for the question. Yes I think, sorry for the, also this is kind of an acrobatic thing we're doing here with the microphone. With respect to the funding through the Inflation Reduction Act proposal, the specific, it's not exactly a line item, but the request and the proposal was to support the further development of the Roadmap with an emphasis on EFP framework and process improvements and streamlining and that sort of COP 20 work that has been now put in the FIWs charge. So the FIW was not anticipated at the time of the IRA proposal being drafted and submitted and subsequently approved, but the Council, after considering sort of pathways to doing this work, set up the FIW as a way to advance a lot of the work that is both in the proposal and that the Roadmap also lays out, so there's that sort of woven piece of it. But the FIW is sort of perhaps the implementer of that piece of the IRA proposal around the EFP work in particular.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:03] Please.

Rebecca Lent [00:25:03] Thank you very much for that, and we can discuss this at the next FIW meeting. But it would be helpful to know then does that mean if the FIW decides at some point in time to have an in-person meeting, then there would be funds available through the IRA Project 3 for such an effort? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:24] I'm going to look to Executive Director Burden to address that.

Merrick Burden [00:25:29] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I appreciate the question Miss Lent. I'm going to sort of answer your question. And I would say we have resources to the Council from a variety of sources and we can use at least two of those to support the Roadmap. So if you were to say this is a priority, regardless of whether we have IRA funding we would use our base funding to support it. Right now this does line up with our IRA funding and so we have resources, a fairly healthy amount to support this work. And so if you did want to have an in-person meeting at this time, we still have access to those funds. If those funds were to disappear and you still wanted to make this a priority, we would say very good and we would draw from another source. So I think the main point I'm trying to convey is we have resources. We hear this is a priority for you and Patricia and I do work our magic to align the financial flows in such a way to support you all.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:38] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:26:40] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just wanted again to support the comments made by Mr. Ugoretz regarding those aspects of the MT Report. But I wanted to weigh-in again just to note my thanks to the advisory subpanel as well. I did appreciate their report too. I didn't mean to omit it in my earlier remarks, but I do think that they've made some good suggestions too. And I think John's correct, he's noted they have representation as does the MT on the FIW. So I just wanted to acknowledge both their report as well as the MT Report that I think will help be very helpful for our future discussions. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:18] Thank you. I'm not seeing any other hands except Chair Pettinger's.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:26] Well I'm glad to see this is, we're moving this along. I'd just like to point out we had swordfish the other night here in town and you don't get it very often and it was pretty damn good. So looking forward to some more of that on our plates in the future, so.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:43] And not seeing hands I have some notes, but there was some guidance on direction and I'm going to look to our staff to summarize that, then come back and make sure we've covered everything. So Kerry or Gilly, either one of you.

Kerry Griffin [00:28:03] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I heard really good discussion and in the sort of broadbrush picture, the most salient point that I heard some support for was that the Roadmap itself, you're not interested in making any changes right now to it, but you do see that as now being in the wheelhouse of the new ad hoc committee, the FIW. And then you expect to see a report back from them in June with more fleshed out recommendations or information regarding these tasks that are in their wheelhouse. If there was another more concrete piece of guidance please help me out here, but that's the main one that I recall.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:10] All right, John Ugoretz, then Rebecca Lent. John.

John Ugoretz [00:29:13] Thanks, and thanks Kerry for the summary. I think you got it in terms of Roadmap and FIW. I think the one thing that the management team asked us was that's sort of outside that is that DGN Report. And I think maybe we just need nods around the table that we're okay getting that as an informational report and then can go off the Year-at-a-Glance or on the year....I don't know, anyway it would go there.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:40] And before I look for that, Rebecca do you have a comment?

Rebecca Lent [00:29:47] Yeah, thanks, just quickly. I'm not sure you mentioned it Kerry, but could we add to the summary of this discussion that resources are available for the FIWs work, or is that too edgy? Maybe that's an obvious thing, as Director Burden said. Thank you. And otherwise I agree with this.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:09] Kerry.

Kerry Griffin [00:30:09] Yes. Thank you. I think that makes sense. That's fine. We write up our decision summary documents and you know try to capture the salient points, especially in guidance when there's not a motion that's in writing. So I appreciate you making sure that those three items are included as the Council guidance.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:33] Okay, so I'm going to look around, not everybody has to nod their head here if you don't want to, but if you don't agree with it I want to hear that. So on the direction for the FIW, their future tasks, and the FIW is many people. You understand there are many tasks and also taking a report that previously had been agendaized, that it will become an informational report in our meeting agendas and that we have funding to do this work. Any disagreement on those items? Not seeing any, Kerry, Gilly, what next?

Kerry Griffin [00:31:28] Great. Thank you. Then in that case I think that concludes your business for this agenda item. I'll look to my colleague here if there's anything else? Thumbs up. We're good to go. Thank you very much. That was a very good and helpful discussion. We appreciate it.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:42] All right, thank you. We're ahead of schedule. Our next agenda item is a groundfish one and we're going to have to find those people for that so let's take a 10-minute break.

J. Administrative Matters

1. Legislative Matters

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, no discussion. All right. Merrick. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:09] Thank you Chair. This topic of the Executive Committee, I didn't know if we were going to be discussing it under this item or under the membership and COPs tomorrow. And I'm thinking there might be some other Council members in a similar situation trying to decide which agenda item, today or tomorrow, or a little bit of both?

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

Merrick Burden [00:00:36] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the question. So I think it's appropriate to discuss it here because it is a recommendation of one of your committees. We would technically take action to establish or modify a committee tomorrow.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:52] Okay, there you go. All right. Well, I'm not seeing any discussion so Virgil.

Virgil Moore [00:01:03] Just clarification, you want to discuss the Executive Committee recommendation here now or do you want to wait until tomorrow?

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

Merrick Burden [00:01:13] I believe it's appropriate to discuss it here today. You can also discuss it tomorrow, but action would be taken tomorrow.

Virgil Moore [00:01:19] Understood. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, if I may then.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:22] Please.

Virgil Moore [00:01:24] I certainly, after the discussion in the Legislative Committee, support the forming of an Executive Committee. And I believe the details of membership, we need to get that on the table and move a recommendation forward for action tomorrow. Certainly we discussed some of that at the LC meeting, but we didn't make any decision per se relative to a recommendation that I remember. I think we said smaller is better, but inclusive is needed was the best I remember it. So I'll defer to the rest of the folks that were there, but I do think we need to get that flushed out and move it forward as soon as possible.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:14] Okay. Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:02:14] Yeah, thank you. I appreciate the remarks Virgil. And so from my perspective, if this Council is inclined to form an Executive Committee, I start with the purpose and why we are considering this and they are matters of some potentially significant fiscal implication, and that's the motivation and I think that's important here. And then I ask myself, who among this table is most informed about those things? And that's our Budget Committee. So the

North Pacific Council has a Budget Committee that is also an Executive Committee. And for our purposes that thought is very appealing and I think consistent with where, and the reasons why we are here and thinking about an Executive Committee at the moment. So that might make it easy to decide to empower the Budget Committee to also operate as an Executive Committee as necessary, so I offer up that observation just in the interest of helping along the discussion.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:31] Okay. Thank you Merrick. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:31] Thank you Chair. I agree we're in some unprecedented times. There's a lot of stuff that's happening quick and may need quick responses. It would be awesome if we could get the entire Council together with a notice meeting but it seems like that's not going to be possible. We're going to need to be more reactive. I'm not excited about creating another committee, especially since I have a feeling I will be staffed, depending on if ODFW has a seat at the table, I will likely be on it at least part of the time, but otherwise it puts a lot of pressure on the Chair, the Vice-Chair, and the Executive Director to make decisions that affect all of us. And maybe having some broader voices, some broader thoughts, you know, many hands make light work. Speaking specifically to the Budget Committee, currently ODFW does not have a seat on the Budget Committee. The other state agencies do. Mr. Pettinger represents Oregon as the Chair. That would be my only concern about the Budget Committee is maybe having ODFW feel a little left out when it's coming to budgets and things that could impact the state of Oregon. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:47] Thank you Lynn. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:04:50] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Merrick for the suggestion. We're dealing a little bit with what-ifs here. There's not a known change coming that needs rapid response, but if one does, and I appreciate that we're trying to be ahead of the game rather than behind it, I think using the Budget Committee works with Lynn's comment noted that perhaps we to then change the Budget Committee. I think if the change is major enough that perhaps calling a closed session of the Council would also be appropriate. And since it would be closed session it wouldn't have to be publicly, well I don't know if it would have to have noticed as closed session, but that's another alternative if it's a really significant change. I think minor changes that have minor budget implications could be handled by the Budget Committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:01] Thank you John. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:06:02] Yeah, thanks. Feeling similar to those who have spoken. I guess it really, I don't know that I've heard....John said the what-if. And I think, yeah, it's what is the scope of the question. The other analogy that's coming to mind is the quick response process where you know even though it takes just one member from a state to approve it, we as the agency who are employed full time to track these things do try to reach out to our other reps before we respond and just that's.....so kind of the impetus behind the suggestion is that there is not time to do that. I just I would think that it's, it is a what-if and it could be, you know, the Executive Committee could meet and say, do we need to decide right now or do we have a day to try to get feedback from our other reps? So the thought there was just, really to me it depends on what it is. I think the scope should be narrow. As a member of the Budget Committee I often find myself should we really be talking about this here? And you know is this is a full Council matter? So I think, I don't know if anyone spoke to it, but it really would be some involved and continued scrutiny of what needs to be decided without full Council involvement versus the urgency of acting quickly. And John's closed session

example, if that were an option that maybe that could be a possibility if the severity of, depending on the severity of the situation. So support of the idea, but yeah, I guess it's a lot of disciplines claim that they're the ones that say it depends, so I think it would depend on what's actually being considered.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:06] Thank you Corey. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:08:06] Yeah, I am appreciative for the concept around having the Executive Committee formed from the Budget Committee plus the state of Oregon. I do think it is important to have all of the states equally represented as we move through it, and I'm not saying that it is exactly the Budget Committee, but I am very supportive of the state's position, meaning we are currently the only state that does not have a state agency on the Budget Committee. I think that the Budget Committee currently, because what it sounds like we're mostly talking about is fiscal, would likely be the list of candidates to pull from. But as somebody who has not served on the Budget Committee, I will say that I am uncomfortable with the nature of having an Executive Committee where there does not necessarily long-term have the ability to have a variety of voices, meaning if we're only looking at our executive team and our state agencies and that is the path through which we move, I think that there are some appointees that could have valuable input into the process that will be left out of that process. And for things that are quick reaction that may be needed, but sometimes we, and I don't mean the Council, I mean people as a whole, make decisions that things need to be quicker action and kind of jump the gun. And so the concept around closed session, et cetera, as a means of bringing things forward that need to be timely and probably timelier, like say it's a July decision when we don't have a meeting between June and September, those pieces, I think we need to be thoughtful in how we include all of our Council members in making these decisions, rather than just, oh we'll put it on an Executive Committee because we don't have a meeting.

Brad Pettinger [00:10:29] Thank you Christa. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:10:33] Thanks Chair. I'm generally supportive of the concept. I think it's a good idea to have something like this in our back pocket. I think it's a good idea, just echoing I think what Mr. Niles was getting at, to be very thoughtful about the scope and how it moves through and possibly maybe some thoughts written down about what goes to Executive Committee versus what goes to leadership as we have it now versus what goes to a QR process or what goes to a closed meeting. I think those are all really interesting and good ideas, and so maybe batting some of that around just to create some sideboards for a potential new Executive Committee wouldn't be a bad idea. In regards to the Budget Committee kind of filling that role, I understand that. I think it's a good idea to take advantage of something we already have, but I do have concerns around sort of the makeup of that in the sense that in my mind this should be as neutral as we can get it, and perhaps that means it's best comprised of folks who are sitting in government seats to be able to be on that, and that's pretty close to the Budget Committee, although I note my neighbor here to the left is on that. And also, just noting that ODF and W, IDF and W, and the tribes are not on that Budget Committee right now. So just airing some thoughts about what could be, how this could be pulled together. My last thought on that is just our Budget Committee has a purpose, it has work, it does important stuff, same with the Legislative Committee. I don't know if it's easier procedurally to just create a third Executive Committee to be tasked with this specific work and have that standing separately and leave the budget and the legislative to sort of do their own work otherwise. So I'll leave it at that.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:32] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:12:39] Thanks, just quick.....and thank you Corey. Just on the Quick Response process I didn't mean to suggest that that literally, perhaps it would work, but I was thinking just on the what-if like if this Committee meets and like Merrick lays out I have to make this decision but I'm like could you be like can I have 12 hours to try to contact Butch and Aja for example or even can I can I try to contact Dave Sones and get their perspectives and report back to you? Maybe that's what used to be a telephone tree. So that's kind of what I....but if Merrick's like I got to decide in the next 15 minutes then that obviously doesn't work unless.....so it really depends. But that was just kind of making more clear with my analogy to the quick response idea was, but not maybe we could have something more similar to how the letter approval works.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:35] Thanks Corey. John.

John Ugoretz [00:13:36] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks to the Corey's squared. It takes me back to the what-if, both of your comments, and you know I'm honestly not envisioning something that comes down on us that has to be responded to within five minutes or 15 minutes or one day unless it is you know an Executive Order that disbands the Councils nationwide in which case so what we can't respond, we're done so no need. Similarly to Miss Ridings, I'm not really supportive of creating a whole new committee body, whatever we call it, to deal with a what-if. I'm more comfortable with looking at an existing body that if need be can step in temporarily one time to help make a decision that we might need advice on. And again, if that decision is something really momentous, I would recommend that it come to the Council as a whole and if timing be damned, then timing be damned, we've got to deal with it.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:59] Thanks John. Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:15:00] Yeah thanks. And John I appreciate all those remarks. I would reflect on where we were about a month ago. And there are a couple of matters internal to our operations I'm not real comfortable putting on the record here in a public meeting, but I would say that there were a few issues that we had to deal with within about a day and so this gave rise to some of this thinking. I mean I think we made the right decisions, the four of us that are the leadership team, but it got me thinking were we lucky? And I mean I think we know what we're doing, but that told me, that experience told me that we would benefit from a few more voices in those decisions. And that was an episode, or a couple of episodes, where it wasn't possible to reach out to the full Council and sent you all an email a few days after the fact saying here's what I did, you might recall it. But hopefully that doesn't happen again, but I think it's more than a hypothetical to me from my experience here over the last couple of months.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:24] John.

John Ugoretz [00:16:24] Thanks Mr. Chair, and yes, thanks Executive Director Burden, that's helpful. And I agree, I would be more comfortable with a broader group reviewing actions like that and identifying that group now. But again, I don't know that we need to create a new group. Honestly, if the Budget Committee is lacking representation of two of the states maybe we need to fix that in general, regardless of what we're talking about and move forward with that. It feels right to me to do that.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:10] Virgil.

Virgil Moore [00:17:10] So a couple of things from my perspective. First, I have served on Executive Committees for several organizations and I've been the beneficiary of an Executive Committee of the Commission in Idaho. Three members, less than a quorum, that was better than just having the Chair of the Commission. It gave us just that much broader, and it was not used very often. And basically we leaned on the trust of the rest of the Commission or other entities that were involved for us to understand when that's necessary. And where you have opportunity to delay until you have a meeting that you can either do it in a closed session or otherwise, that's a decision you have to make. Our current Executive Director is using an ad hoc team to help him and we could continue doing that trusting our Chair and Vice-Chair, himself and I don't know who your fourth was, past Chair?

Merrick Burden [00:18:23] (Off-mic) Kelly.

Virgil Moore [00:18:23] Oh, okay. And that works out, you know, and maybe that's all we need. But my recommendation is we have less than a quorum in size, so we've got to be cautious about more than six, I guess you would say, or seven, I'm not sure what our quorum rules are, and that way it's easy to get together, and I think it's going to have to be a separate Committee because of that.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:51] There's six right now.

Virgil Moore [00:18:51] I don't think we can maneuver these other committees to give the kind of representation that we're talking about here, but we could, I mean it's just a matter of what we want to do. But my recommendation is that, and I think we used the term in the Legislative Committee, "nimble", and we need to help our Executive Director be more nimble by having the benefit of a little broader input that he is not inhibited on using at a moment's notice. And again, these are...it's hard to say what it's going to be. Hopefully we won't have to do this, but by having that committee in place knowing that we've had to do these things, and it's useful, it's helpful, just from my personal experience on both sides of it. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:47] Thank you Virgil. We have six right now. What is our....as far as.....Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:19:54] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I think where you're going is, what is the current composition of the Budget Committee and the Legislative Committee is a close parallel. So we have seven members. If we grow in size beyond that we start to run across quorum issues. But we have the Council Chair, one voting member from each state, it doesn't say agency, it just says from each state. One of those should be an at-large member, or one at-large member, sorry, Pacific States, and then National Marine Fisheries Service, and that gets us to seven.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:32] Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:32] Thanks. And I don't know if it's necessary to add to that, but I think the comments made, just to clarify that each state is represented on the Budget Committee right now because it is, it's not state-specific, and I guess that's why you have definition of terms and things,

so each state is represented. It's correct as Miss Ridings said, the tribes are not represented on there. When this makeup of the Committee was decided precedes me so I'm sure there was some discussion in there and the allowance of the at-large member there I'd have to do the quick math but as we pointed out if it were the desire of Oregon to have a state rep on there and the desire of the Council to do that, those are Chair appointments to that, there is that at-large, or excuse me the at-large seat is currently taken up but there is the allowance to have a state rep beside the Chair who is currently the Oregon state rep in there. So, but I guess what I'm getting at is within this context there's the opportunity to discuss the makeup.

Marc Gorelnik [00:22:05] Yeah, I was simply going to point out that there are only six voting members on the Budget Committee because Chris Oliver is not a voting member. There is room to add a member to that Committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:19] John.

John Ugoretz [00:22:19] Thanks, and I appreciate this conversation. It is actually making my thought process evolve, and some of Virgil's comments. I think perhaps given what we're talking about and given that this is about if something comes down the pipe that requires quick action to affect a change in the way we're spending money, the way we're doing things, and we want to go beyond the existing executive group committee, perhaps the best thing is simply one representative from each state, one representative from the tribes, and one representative from NOAA. That's six people. Should be nimble. My assumption is the states will do their due diligence to reach out to their constituencies if needed and that would help broaden the discussion in those rapid situations.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:37] Thank you John. Anyone else? Vice-Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:37] And that.....one thing I would add to that, because I've thought about this, I think that when the.....but I'm going to guess, when the Budget Committee was created previously they said that the Chair of the Council would be on there. And I think is that the same for the Legislative Committee? Oh, it's not. So on the Budget Committee the Chair of the Council is automatically on there and he could serve one of the state seats. In addition to what you're saying, I'm not changing what you're saying John. I thought about this. The Council may not want the Chair and the Vice-Chair to be on the Executive Committee, or you may want the Chair and the Vice-Chair to be on the Executive Committee because of the nature of the decisions. And then you can think about that in the context, are they additional members in addition to each of the states and we think about the quorum thing, or could the Chair and the Vice-Chair serve as one of the state reps? So I think it's two pathways.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:53] John.

John Ugoretz [00:24:54] And just to be clear, what I'm suggesting for this purpose, which is why I've evolved from just use the Budget Committee, is the state agencies be represented. I think if we're talking about something that Council operations and the Councils are, you know made up by these particular states and the tribes and NOAA. I think that's kind of the key components here and I feel it's important that those agencies have a voice in something like this.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:32] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:25:35] Thank you Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate this conversation. Just thinking about, you know, the nature of how, you know, the Council is run and how the role of leadership and structuring what we do, I think it would be....I don't think this is what you're necessarily suggesting John but just in the interest of clarity, I think it would be awkward to not have the Council Chair be on an Executive Committee. I still think we can get to what you're suggesting by having all the state agency reps on there but I do think we also need the Chair.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:09] John.

John Ugoretz [00:26:09] Yeah, and thank you. No, I wasn't thinking of excluding the Chair. In fact my thought process was that you already engage with the, is it the Executive Committee? I forget what you call the three of you, whatever you are, yes. So I assumed that that would also be happening because it already happens and that this is the who do you go to broaden that discussion with in these specific situations.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:46] Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:26:46] I think that's a good way to think about it. I think there is a problem. If we're not going to shut out the existing leadership team, that means those are two members of this Committee. And then if you're going to have one representative from each state agency, you're now up to six. You include NMFS and the tribes you're now at eight, and that's too many.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:08] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:27:14] I think Butch has been waiting, I can...

Butch Smith [00:27:20] Well, kind of like we talked about in the Legislative Committee, this is kind of a reactionary committee to deflect or react or, you know to survive and there are state agency people that are all sent by governors of a different persuasion from what's currently in the White House, which is fine, but I think for the next four years your political persuasion is going to have to be checked out at the door. And to survive, to do what we got to do for the people we gotta do, if we don't think a little differently at times than when some would like to think or not, I think, you know, I mean I don't want to be on the record, but I think that it could be differently outcome like some have already found out and I don't want to end up like that on just because our principals say this or this is the way our governors think we should think or whatever. I think on this committee, and I'm not looking for a job, but there are people in this committee that come from communities that have to work with both parties to survive and have learned how to do that and might have some little way of differently looking at things than some other ones, not saying that anybody's wrong or right the way they look at things, but add another perspective on not every issue that's going to come before this Executive Committee on a few, and I think that there are a few of us out here that have those experiences that you should draw from, maybe not on a permanent basis or maybe there should be, you know depending on the issue, and if this Council is so rigid that you have to have people named instead of, you know, alternates or whatever to be used as the different occasions show up, then so be it. But I don't want you to forget why we thought about this committee, what I heard anyway in there. I could be, you know I'm from Ilwaco and I don't always hear the right things, but that's kind of thought why we were talking about this and so I'd just like to throw that out there. There's people with skills on this committee that may

look at it through a different lens. That lens might be totally wrong, you know far be it from me, but I think we should need to maybe think about that a little bit as we're forming this committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:42] Okay. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:30:42] Thanks Butch, I appreciate you voicing your opinion, but if you think that we're here thinking through a partisan lens then we need to have a chat because that's not what WDFW does here at the Council, which is a non-partisan place and we listen to all perspectives and learn how to work with everyone in Washington State. So I'd like to talk to you after this possibly. But my other comment was going to be I'm hearing two possible models that, and again we're discussing now and maybe sleeping on things and coming tomorrow, but you could do the three amigos plus Kelly as one group and then have another group, Executive Committee. You lose the synergy of being able to talk together but then you could fit in the perspectives of more people with the chore of summarizing the viewpoints of each group falling on Councils, the Executive Director probably so. That's just another model I had in mind of you could have your standing leadership team and then talk to the Executive Committee separately and then you have, don't have a quorum at any one time, but this is something that came to mind in the earlier discussions.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:04] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:32:04] Thank you Chair. Yeah, and I almost didn't raise my hand because there are a million different ways that you can do this. But it occurs to me that, yeah, these Executive Committees exist elsewhere and they have charges already set up and if we knew the exact scope of the charge it might easily fall out who should be on it. And so I think, yeah we're talking about this sort of nebulous set of things that we might have to decide quickly, but if you made a list of the kinds of things that you would take to that Committee then you might easily be like, oh we need X, Y, and Z people. So I'm curious if you have a charge drafted anywhere if that could help this discussion.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:55] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:32:56] Yeah, thank you Miss Szumylo. I've just been waiting for this conversation to happen and unfold, but that is on my mind, which is if this is a committee that this Council is interested in establishing then I don't have a charge to share with you right now but it's not hard to put one together. Like you say, Executive Committees are formed all the time and they're for a fairly specific and consistent purpose so I don't think it'd be hard to put one together. And then we would bring that back for your consideration tomorrow as we go through membership appointments and whatnot. So that's where my head is. If you want to pursue this more and have something to look at tomorrow Kelly and I would work on it this afternoon.

Brad Pettinger [00:33:44] Marc.

Marc Gorelnik [00:33:44] Yeah, I agree with the Executive Director. That's a good place to leave it for now. But I just want to emphasize a point that this body, whatever its composition, is for truly exigent circumstances where you could not rapidly convene a closed session.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:05] Okay. Thank you Marc for the clarity. All right, okay, I'm seeing people saying yep. All right, okay. Trying to think of anything else that we need to discuss on this agenda item. Merrick do you have anything else?

Merrick Burden [00:34:25] No, your task here was to consider the Legislative Committee Report and recommendations and I think the body of that report in terms of this Council's action and consideration was this Executive Committee topic. So unless you have other guidance you'd like to give to the Legislative Committee or other responses you'd like to make in response to the Legislative Committee Report I think your action is done here with J.1.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:52] Okay, well we'll close that out.

2. Approve Council Meeting Record

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] We'll go to the approving the meeting record. So with that I'll entertain discussion or a motion to accept those minutes or modify. You guys must really like sitting in this room. I just.....they did turn down the fan so it's actually fairly comfortable here right now blowing down on my bald head it's.....Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:00:41] Mr. Chair, in order to advance things I'm going to go out on a limb here and make a motion on something I don't normally speak to.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:54] Bless you.

Dani Evenson [00:00:54] But I move that the Council approve the meeting record as specified in J.2, Attachment 1, Draft Council Meeting Record from November 2024.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:13] I'm looking for a second. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. All right. Okay. All right, I don't think you really want to speak to your motion so I'll just call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:01:31] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:31] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right that motion passes unanimously. And so as the Executive Director spoke to earlier we'll meet tomorrow at eight o'clock.

3. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] All right, thank you Kelly. Questions on Kelly's overview? All right, very thorough. All right, well regarding the advisory panels, positions, any discussion needed here? All right, I don't see any so with that I'll....as far as appointment to the EAS. I would like to....Corey Ridings. Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:00:30] Thank you Chair. I have a motion. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel. Oregon at-large, Mr. Scott McMullen. At-large, Mr. Mark Alan Lovewell.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:59] All right, thank you. Second? Seconded by David Sones. Thank you. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:01:04] Thank you Chair. Both of these gentlemen have served on the ES before, have done an excellent job representing the interest of their communities, and bringing thoughtful solutions to the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel. So they are welcome and invited back and we appreciate their service.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:24] All right, thank you Corey. All right, any discussion needed? Nope. All right, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:01:31] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:32] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you Corey. Okay, regarding the GAP. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:45] Thank you Chair. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel. At-large trawl fisheries, Mr. Chris Cooper. Oregon charter boat, Mr. Andy Martin. Additionally, I request the Executive Director re-advertise for the tribal seat.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:04] Very good. All right, seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. All right, please speak your motion Lynn as appropriate.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:13] Thank you Chair. Both Mr. Cooper and Mr. Martin have been involved in the GAP for a little while now. For one reason or another they missed submitting their applications on time. They have both been active and engaged members of the GAP and would appreciate their continued participation. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:29] Very good. Thank you. All right. Okay I'll call for vote. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:02:38] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:39] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right, go to the HMSAS. Looking at Christa Svensson. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:02:53] Thank you Mr. Chair. I move the Council make the following appointments to the Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel. Commercial south of Point Conception it's Joshlyn Cardoza. And for northern charter boat operator, Mr. Jon Yokomizo.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:13] All right, thank you. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Please speak to your motion.

Christa Svensson [00:03:18] Yeah, thank you. I've known Joshlyn for over a decade in the pole and line albacore fishery and just in saying that it's kind of amazing how time has flown. It's been fun to watch her grow both in HMS fisheries and in the management around them. So I want to thank her for really leaning into the Council process as a public member for the last couple of years. She's shown up to U.S.-Canada treaty negotiations. She participated in the HMS Roadmap Workshop last year, and I think that that's important because she comes from AFA, which is really strongly associated with North Pacific albacore, but she has the ability to really kind of help bridge that gap with other species. And I am just going to say to Joshlyn, you know welcome to the team and I'm really thankful that you're willing to work so hard on developing opportunities for U.S. fishermen. With regard to Mr. Yokomizo's appointment, I want to thank him for serving for the last three years on the HMSAS. And also note that it is important to have a northern charter boat seat, especially considering we are expecting management actions on North Pacific albacore, which has traditionally been the species north of Conception. But we are starting to see Pacific bluefin being encountered increasingly north of Conception as well so important to have that representation. And just in reaching out to advisory panel members, they have said that his contributions in the last three years have been helpful. And just to say thank you for being engaged in the process and we hope to see more engagement like we do all of our members. So with that, I will say thank you for letting me make the motion and congratulations provided this moves forward.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:27] All right. Well, thank you Christa. All right, with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:05:35] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:36] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. Okay, so as far as the.....I guess the Number 4 to provide guidance to the staff regarding the vacant GAP and Scientific and Statistical Committee, I imagine we will look to Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:05:58] Yeah, thanks. I don't think we need a motion here. I just wanted to support guidance to staff to update the roster to move Dr. Dan Holland from the at-large seat on the SSC to the Northwest Fisheries Science Center seat on the SSC. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:18] Appreciate that. And I guess we're going to post the need for more applicants here as appropriate. Okay moving down to ad hoc committees. I guess I'll open the floor for discussion. Okay, or a motion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:41] Thank you Chair. I have a motion drafted that I think may lead to a little bit of discussion.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:49] Okay.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:49] I move that the Council dissolve the following ad-hoc committees. Cost Recovery Committee, Groundfish Electronic Monitoring Policy Advisory Committee, Groundfish Electronic Monitoring Technical Advisory Committee, Equality and Environmental Justice Committee, National Standards 4, 8, and 9 Committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:11] Lynn I think you said equality instead of equity.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:14] Equity and Environmental Justice Committee. Reading is hard on day last.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:20] Okay, all right and looking for a second. Seconded by Aja Szumylo. Thank you Aja. All right, please speak your motion as appropriate.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:30] Thank you Chair. What I think led us to looking at all of these ad hoc committees was the Executive Order that Miss Ames mentioned in her overview. And I will freely admit that when I first read in the briefing book that the EEJ Committee had been dismantled, I was...I can't say exactly the words I was thinking at the time, but I was dismayed, I was angry, was planning to come in here hot on that issue. Luckily there was some time that passed, was able to talk to members of the EEJ Committee and better understand that it's not that we're in favor, we want to no longer do this work, but there's some potential ties to our budget and our funding if we do not follow this Executive Order. I appreciate the folks who talked to me about that, talked me off that ledge to come in hot. Still disappointed we have to do this, but I think it's at the risk of some of our budget and funding I think we need to disband this committee at this time, hoping we can re-institute it at some time in the very near future. As some of us discussed earlier in the week, we still do have the National Standards that help with some of the work that that committee was working on. And just because we don't have a committee doesn't mean we're not thinking about it as we move forward. On the National Standards 4,8, 9 Committee, as Miss Ames said, it sounds like NMFS no longer is planning on bringing those forward, therefore we don't need that committee. And then as we were looking at the ad hoc committees during the Legislative Committee discussion and some other discussions earlier in the week, we realized there were three kind of groundfish related committees that had not met in at least five, if not more, years, the Cost Recovery Committee and the GEMPAC and GEMTAC. Those committees seem to have concluded their work at the moment. Should the need arise in the future we could re-institute a similar committee. They just don't seem to be warranted keeping them on the books at this point. So those are my talking points for this motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:51] All right, thank you Lynn. Okay, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:09:57] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:57] Opposed no? Abstentions? Discussion? You want to have some discussion? Okay. I need to have a hand raised before I can have discussion. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:10:21] Yeah, thank you. I would appreciate the opportunity to have a little discussion on this topic. I am one of the people that asked to have this committee initially. To say

that I was dismayed in terms of how this was outlined as a must was a bit of an understatement based upon the work that we have really set out in the EEJ Committee. I've been a pretty strong advocate in that committee in terms of the need for having the work done with reflection in regard to small businesses, small scale ports, which with the exception of Seattle is every single port we have when you start looking at the economics. So it is unfortunate that we have this tied to funding. I think it is just worth reflecting for a minute on the fact that we're having this conversation and willing to make these changes because of budget and funding and what kind of position that may put us in in the future because we didn't have a more robust conversation today, which is one of the reasons I wanted to say something other than just make a and move on. We've had a number of Executive Orders. I think we need to have probably a more robust conversation moving forward on how we handle all of them, because sometimes this Council has moved quickly and other times they have not. And if it is funding related only, then maybe we need to look at ourselves in addition to looking at what the organization or the committee does. I am really appreciative of the work that has been done in and around the topic. Like I say, reaching out to small scale ports, fishermen that are from all walks of life, charter, recreational, commercial, helping them become more engaged in a public process I think is critical. And I think even things like our ability to have people call in and publicly testify, which is an EEJ topic, really helps level the playing field and helps keep costs down for people who are having to travel hundreds, and in some cases more than hundreds of miles to testify for approximately five minutes of their time plus hotel and all of the other components around that. So I do continue to think that the work is important. I do also think that sometimes we need to have committees disband for a variety of reasons, and I'm extremely appreciative that we are using this opportunity to take a look at all of our committees and remove committees that really don't meet the definition of ad hoc in terms of short-term duration that have not been meeting in quite some time. And I think all of the work that is done in those committees has the potential to come back to us, you know whether that's in June, whether that's five years from now. But the ability to set up a committee based upon what the current needs of the Council is I think is important rather than trying to change what the directive of a committee that has not been meeting in a number of years was to meet the current needs. So I am really supportive of taking a look at everything. I'm appreciative of the Council's willingness to take a look at everything and think about what our needs will be, whether they're financial or not moving forward. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:46] Thank you Christa. Anybody else? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:14:56] Thanks Mr. Chair. Regarding the EEJ committee, I'll just, I guess, second and thank my colleagues who have already spoken about this. I feel very similarly. This one is incredibly hard because I continue to think that the work that the committee was doing and would have moved forward to do and the charge of that committee just remains incredibly important for the work that this Council is doing. Throughout this meeting we've heard a lot about hearing about conditions that are on the water and the importance of bringing that into our management decisions, and that's a huge part of what EEJ is. We heard yesterday, maybe it was the day before, but it was from Mr. Steve Godin who came to us and showed us some things he was working on and it was this great sheet to get more data that was coming from the folks he worked with who were on the water trying to develop that, thinking about how that could be useful. And it was an example of citizen or civic science, and a lot of the theory and thinking of citizen science was developed within the environmental justice movement about responding to when as a person your government is not meeting your needs or caring for your needs, and providing the data and information that you need as a community, you start the process and do it yourself. And so I

was reminded of EEJ when he was speaking to us. I think EEJ is just, it's so many things that we're doing already. It's already in a lot of what we do and we're going to continue to do it. Ultimately, it's about how we include and care for people and especially those people who aren't in the room. So continuing to think about that as we move forward is the responsibility of the entire Council and everyone who participates in the Council process. How we include those voices, especially those who have been historically muffled is really important, and we lean on our advisors and ourselves to continue to question who those folks are and how we can bring them in, and we don't need a committee to do that. I think I'm going to stop there and just thank the Council for doing this work and just reiterate we understand the potential for funding issues around this and we're doing this today for the overall benefit of the Council. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:45] Thank you Corey. Okay, anyone else? All right, with that I'll call for the question. Those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:17:59] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:18:00] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. All right, thank you. And then I think the only thing we have left would be the.....Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:18:20] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. You'll recall our conversation, I think that was yesterday but I don't recall, all the days are starting to bleed together in my mind, but we did spend some time recently discussing the prospect of an Executive Committee. And so yesterday evening drafted up a draft charge, looking at this again now with fresh eyes I admit it is a tad clunky, but did indicate that I would bring that back to you for consideration as you contemplate whether to establish an Executive Committee. Should you wish to establish one it would become one of our standing committees rather than an ad hoc. So our standing committees right now are the Budget Committee and the Legislative Committee, and Executive Committees are also usually treated as a standing committee like those two are. One other thing of note, after looking at our COPs and also looking at doing some math to figure out what it takes to have a quorum, I believe, and I believe the Vice-Chairman here next to me believe that we have room to expand our Budget Committee if you want to follow that route and have the Budget Committee also be an Executive Committee. And I think that one additional person would not risk a quorum. So those are some thoughts for you. You have your draft charge. We do have the possibility of adding seats if you would like to follow that route and have the Budget Committee also play a dual role. We can establish a new committee or do nothing. And if we do nothing then I would continue to, as needed, work with what we call the Leadership Team if there are any urgent matters and, you know, perhaps if there's one of you that has expertise in something, I would call up one of you to help out too as necessary. So that's where we are and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:29] Okay, questions for Executive Director Burden? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:20:36] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Executive Director Burden for preparing the charge. After our discussion yesterday and thinking about it, I think the charge is consistent with what we discussed and it lays things out succinctly and clearly. I do feel that again after that discussion, while I originally felt the Budget Committee could handle this, I think it's better to do it as a separate Executive Committee. And like I said yesterday, I think the membership of that committee would be appropriate to be the state agency representatives plus the tribes and NOAA Fisheries and the Chair of the Council.

Brad Pettinger [00:21:28] Okay. Marc Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:21:30] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I think I agree with Mr. Ugoretz. One question I have about the draft charge mentions to this Executive Committee to facilitate decision-making between full Council meetings. And one thing we discussed yesterday I believe, was the possibility of convening a closed session. Obviously that's going to depend upon the exigency of the situation if it has to be done. If a response or a decision is needed within a few days, obviously that's not feasible. And sometimes maybe there's plenty of time to handle it at a scheduled Council meeting, but there's an in-between period where it is conceivable to convene a closed session for the full Council to consider that. So I want to make sure that that is included in this draft charge.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:38] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:22:41] Yes, thank you Mr. Gorelnik for pointing that out. I would view a closed, I'll call it an emergency closed session of the Council as being a Council meeting, and so that if we view it that way then this text should cover your concern.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:03] Thank you Marc. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:05] Thank you Chair. I'm kind of in line with Mr. Ugoretz on the thinking of this. Just one consideration with the state agency position, I know we will probably all try to have a primary person so there's some consistency, but hopefully there would be some leeway for whoever is available from the state agency. If it's a short notice meeting and it's during the middle of the legislative session that could change who is available. Just hoping that a little leeway in case there's other duties being called on at our regular jobs.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:49] Okay. Anybody else? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:23:50] Thank you Chair Pettinger. This is a question for Merrick about the charge. I guess is the intent then with everything that everyone's mentioned about closed sessions as well that if we were starting to bump up towards a Council meeting and it was something that could be resolved at that meeting that any things that would come up that would normally be under the charge of the Executive Committee would then come up in closed session or one of the committees that's associated with the Council instead? Or what's your intention there?

Brad Pettinger [00:24:25] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:24:25] Yeah, thank you. The intention here is that we should use the full Council whenever possible to make major decisions. If there's some reason why waiting for a normal Council meeting that's regularly scheduled, if that won't work then I think the second tiering is can we and should we convene a emergency closed session of the Council, and if that doesn't work then we have the Executive Committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:55] Okay. Further discussion? Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:25:05] Mainly a question. Action that needs to be taken here is approval of the committee charge and then approval of the committee structure. Are those one and the same or?

Brad Pettinger [00:25:18] Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:25:23] Yeah, thank you. I apologize for not outlining the steps here, but there would be three parts to a motion. One would be to establish a committee, the Executive Committee. The second one would be to outline the membership structure. The third decision would be to adopt the charge for that committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:59] Okay. Hand up? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:25:59] Thanks Mr. Chair. I was just going to ask whether there's going to be a motion for this, but Virgil handled it so I was going to put my hand down.....(lost audio).....the motion.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:09] I'm sorry Corey but we couldn't get that.

Corey Niles [00:26:16] Sorry, can you hear me okay?

Brad Pettinger [00:26:17] Better there.

Corey Niles [00:26:20] Sorry about that. I would say I had some thoughts but I will wait for the motion, speaking to the motion. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:28] You said you have a motion?

Corey Niles [00:26:32] No. I was hoping Virgil was going to make the motion or someone else, and I was going to wait to speak to my thoughts.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:37] Okay. All right. Virgil Moore.

Virgil Moore [00:26:43] I'll take a shot at it and see based on what Executive Director Burden told us. So I would move that we establish an Executive Committee. That we adopt the.....oh okay, I have to make it bigger....(laughter).... I move we establish an Executive Committee. We adopt the draft charge language as the committee charge. And I think I'll stop there and we can discuss as another motion the makeup of the committee.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:35] Okay Virgil, is the language on the screen accurate?

Virgil Moore [00:27:41] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:27:42] Okay. Need a second. Seconded by John Ugoretz. Thank you John. Virgil, speak your motion as needed.

Virgil Moore [00:27:44] I think we've discussed this at length. I think the work for the charge in establishing the committee is pretty straightforward. And we get that done then we can get on with the business of deciding how we're going to have the membership put together.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:03] Okay, very good. All right, any discussion? All right, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:28:12] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:12] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously so. All right. We're going into about membership on the committee as far as what the structure as far as who would be on it. So I'll open the floor for anymore discussion? John.

John Ugoretz [00:28:38] If you want to discuss go ahead.

Brad Pettinger [00:28:45] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:28:45] Thank you Chair. Yeah, in discussion I was thinking about what John Ugoretz mentioned earlier and I think he said very, very close to what I had in mind. The only difference I think is I think he mentioned the Chair. And I might make the suggestion that we do the Chair or the Vice-Chair simply to provide opportunities if the Chair or Vice-Chair was unable to make that meeting, recognizing the rest of the positions are governmental and it's sort of a day-to-day, daily job thing for them, but for us appointeds, including the Chair and the Vice-Chair, you know, we have jobs or other tasks or situations that might make us unavailable to do that. So just building in some flexibility there in case the Chair was not available.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:39] Okay. Anyone else? It's an interesting situation with the leadership. We drop somebody off the leadership and the committee, but it is the direction you're going here, but I guess the core rules would necessitate that. Okay, anymore discussion? Do we have a motion? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:30:11] Thanks Mr. Chair. I think I can hopefully pull this off. I move that the membership of the Executive Committee include the following: One member from each of the four state agencies. One member from the tribes. One member from NOAA Fisheries. And the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Council.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:01] Okay. John, is the language accurate?

John Ugoretz [00:31:06] Yes.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:06] Merrick. Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:31:06] Yeah, just a question before we second this and iron it out. My understanding is that an Executive Committee should be made up of Council members and some of the language could be interpreted to be more loose than that. Does that change your thinking?

John Ugoretz [00:31:26] It does not reflect what I said so I'm going to change what I said....(laughter)...

Brad Pettinger [00:31:38] Okay.

John Ugoretz [00:31:40] After the word "following" and before the colon, Council members. Now it reflects what I said.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:54] Okay John. Okay looks good?

John Ugoretz [00:31:54] It does, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:31:54] All right, looking for a second? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Thank you Lynn. All right. All right John, speak to your motion as needed.

John Ugoretz [00:32:06] Thank you. I think as we discussed yesterday and briefly today, I think decisions as envisioned in this charge are those that affect the Council and its operations and that this Council is representative of the state's tribes and NOAA Fisheries and this would be consistent with such emergency decisions.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:32] Okay. All right John, and thank you Corey for including that in there just to cover. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:32:42] Sorry Mr. Chair, I didn't mean to cut you off.

Brad Pettinger [00:32:44] No you're good.

Corey Niles [00:32:46] Yeah, thanks. Just was going to speak in support of the motion and I think I'll start with I hope we don't have to use this committee and I think John used the term "emergency" and that's kind of what I have in mind about what we would do and use this for issues of the utmost seriousness. I also want to go back to our discussion yesterday. And I'm going to first apologize to Butch. I think I overreacted to what he said and leading to the thought that I hope that the Executive Committee when they meet it meets in a way where there is time for us agency folks to reach out to our Council members from our states and get their perspectives. If this committee is dealing with some very serious things then we want to know what Butch thinks and what Aja thinks. And I know Butch, as well as anyone, his perspectives come from the folks that he works with in a community that's broader than most of us are connected to, same with Aja. So I really hope that, yeah, hope we don't have to use this, and if we do there's time to talk more broadly to folks that aren't on the committee. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:34] Okay, thank you Corey. Anyone else? All right, no hands. With that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:34:47] Aye.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:48] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. All right it takes us to the Council charge, or the committee's charge which is.....briefing book? Oh we did? It was a twofer. That's part of our Council efficiency. Okay, all right, Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:35:22] Great, thank you Chair, Council members. I have received your appointments for the Ecosystem Advisory Subpanel, Groundfish Advisory Subpanel, Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel. We intend to update the roster with those appointments as well as update the SSC roster to move Dr. Dan Holland from the at-large seat to the Northwest

Fisheries Science Center seat. I heard some discussion in, well, it was specific in the motion from Miss Mattes to re-advertise for the vacant GAP tribal seat. I understand from Mr. Sones, discussions with Mr. Sones that they've got some folks that came and shadowed at this meeting, so hopefully we didn't scare them off and they'll be willing to put in their application. We also have the three at-large seats and my assumption is you are going to want me to re-advertise to those and maybe try to take a different tact at some different outreach to see if we can't get some folks to put their names in for those positions. So I will go back, and I see head nods so I'm assuming that is the task here. We had a good motion to remove the ad hoc committees that had either accomplished their charge or their work was no longer needed so we will update the roster accordingly. And then we also have a new standing committee, the Executive Committee, as you just moved here. So we will work to update our roster and those materials will be available for you in the April briefing book. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:05] Okay. Great work everyone.

4. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Well that concludes public comment and takes us to Council action, which is before you. And now I'll turn to Executive Director Burden to take us from here.

Merrick Burden [00:00:13] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and thanks everyone for the questions and for the comments as we organize our thoughts around our workload and schedule. So maybe in the interest of getting things going, a couple things that have stood out to me after listening to your questions and some of the comments from advisory bodies and the public. One is, let's see, I think a relatively easy one. I heard some interesting and quite honestly good reasons to schedule the HMS groups as an in-person in June, so if you have any additional confirmation on that, that would be welcome. Let's see, another major question. If we do want to shuffle our salmon matters off of June, that would essentially allow us to shorten up the June meeting. I think we could drop a day and shorten up that meeting at that time. That's another thing to consider. And then throughout the week, and as we just heard from public comment, we've talked about whether and how we could gain clarity on our IRA work on adaptive management and whether tying that in with groundfish flexibility made sense. And I don't know that there's a whole lot that we could do between now and April. We may have...we could put something together that might help with that discussion, but I don't...there was reference to prior work being done on some of these groundfish questions before, and I think there's questions that I have and my staff have about the accuracy of some of those materials, so we're a little bit reluctant to say we're, you know, a long ways down the road, and so I'm not sure if we have as much as some people would think that we have on some of these groundfish flexibility questions. And so as we think about what we could do in April, we might be able to have a conversation about essentially a plan. What do we want to do? I don't know that we'd make a whole lot of headway but that could be valuable too. So those are three thoughts that have come to my mind in the interest of getting us started.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:35] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:02:35] Thank you Chair. I was going to try to take a low hanging fruit with addressing part of Number 3. The GMT pointed out what they thought their priorities should be for June, and I think they are on track there and would concur with those priorities. Second, I'm hearing from ODFW staff that they would prefer to have HMS in-person in June if possible. And then a question that came up, currently the IRA project is being worked on by EWG folks. As we shift some of that work to these groundfish related items will they have a role? Maybe there's some staff, some people there that we can leverage as we work on these projects moving forward. Don't expect an answer on that last piece, just a thought to consider as we move forward. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:34] All right. Ryan Wulff

Ryan Wulff [00:03:36] Yeah, thank you Chair, and appreciate Merrick's comments there. I think NMFS supports everything you just stated and laid out. I did want to note a couple things because you mentioned it in your overview before we went through the reports regarding the ESA Workgroup agenda item for the June agenda. And yes, just to confirm what you said, we have modified some of our groundfish biological opinions to remove that requirement for the ESA Workgroup and said the tasks that have previously been taken up by this group could be just developed and presented publicly by NMFS. We do intend to provide the Council an informational

report for the June meeting on this and we will reevaluate opportunities for the Council, industry, and public to receive ESA protected species, bycatch information and discuss new possible management measures as warranted, and there'll be further evaluation of those opportunities in the future. That's where NMFS is on that. And then just wanted to further support the removal of salmon in June, given all the points you made regarding the flexibility that that will provide, especially after going through all the work here in March and April. And that's it for NMFS. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:00] Okay. Thanks Ryan. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:05:02] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. Going back to Miss Mattes's comment and Executive Director Burden's comments regarding the HMS in June. I'm supportive of the AS recommendation that they meet in-person. I understand their rationale. For the management team, however, maybe some clarification if you're thinking on having them meet in-person. If NOAA staff are unable to travel I see no purpose in having the management team meet in-person because a large portion of that team is NOAA staff and they might as well meet virtually if half of them are going to have to be virtual anyway.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:47] Thank you John. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:05:47] Yeah, just noting on that, it's not clear if that will be the case for NOAA just at this point. I take John's point, but it is.... Council meetings in general have been just recently put in as an exemption to travel. So we're still seeing what that will mean as far as the amount of participation. So there still is the chance that we would be able to have MT members there in-person but I don't know the answer yet. Thanks.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:10] Thank you Ryan. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:06:15] Yeah, just to weigh-in on the HMSAS request, supportive of that. I do want to note that I think we may have a pretty heavy lift for them. They've got 9 workshops for IATTC in and of itself between now and that meeting. We'll likely have recommendations for Northern Committee Joint Bluefin Working Group. And between that meeting and the September meeting is also the annual meeting for ICAT, or not ICAT, excuse me, IATTC, so that is a bigger topic than usual. And then additionally, we will have some outcomes from the FIW, which may lead to more further discussion. So not asking for more time, just wanting to really lean in on their, this is a heavier workload, another reason for being in-person and that they got a lot to do.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:12] Okay, thanks Christa. Anyone else? Okay, Director Burden, oh Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:23] Sorry, this isn't anything specific to our April and June agendas or our Year-at-a-Glance. The SAS Report brought up, or STT Report brought up some concerns about workload, especially since I believe they've lost a pretty work-heavy member of their team recently. I know the ODFW STT members spoke to me this morning about maybe limiting some of the ad hoc work group work that happens over the next few months so that they have time to focus on their core duties. I don't know that a motion or specific guidance needs to be there, but I did want to bring it up since staff requested that I do that, do such, just to be really cognizant of the STT workload and what else we ask of them right now. Thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:14] Corey Niles

Corey Niles [00:08:18] Thanks Mr. Chair. Kind of remembering the benefit of being there in person, but I've kind of a lot.....what is the.... I don't want to jump around all these various topics but I do have thoughts. What is the plan? Were you about to wrap it up by handing it back to Merrick or are we going through this in a more systematic manner? And apologies for not tracking

Brad Pettinger [00:08:51] Corey, I didn't get that. I mean, as far as, you kind of faded out a little bit, so could you speak more clearly into the microphone?

Corey Niles [00:09:01] Okay. Well, I'm almost....face is almost touching my laptop, but I don't know what's going on. Are we taking items one by one here? Were you looking to wrap it up soon? There's like at least four topics that have come up and I wanted to respond to some of them, but don't want to do it if we have a more orderly way of approaching it.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:34] Well just tell us what's on your mind Corey. I mean, I think we're.....

Corey Niles [00:09:36] Well the topic one, what Ryan spoke to about the Endangered Species Workgroup. He phrased it in a way that we've talked about it with NMFS a little bit, but he phrased it in a way that sounded much different, but it sounds like there'll be an opportunity in June to talk about that. I don't know that NMFS recognizes the value of that group that it's had around the Council. So I just wanted to note that, that it sounds like there'll be opportunity in June to do that. And second thing, I don't know if we're going to talk about the April.....first I should say, you know, I really appreciated the testimony today from Heather and Ken and others and Jeff. And as Heather spoke to, we agree that the flexibility topics should be a priority. I think we sent a similar, very similar message at the conclusion of the gear switching items that we wanted to move on, raise the footprint and move on to ideas that could really help. And having been part of the IRA project discussion through the budget committee and Ecosystem Work Group, I fully agree with those ideas that they fit within that topic. And I think that the April meeting could really help with the scoping and maybe initial planning of how to take that up into, I know I didn't hear Merrick speak to it today, but you know part of the Project 1 was, part of that was to hire a consultant and increase our capacity to help here. So just a long way of saying I think that April opportunity as the GAP and others have said it would be really beneficial. And lastly, I had some ecosystem thoughts, but I'll just stop with those two and see if there's response.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:51] Okay, well, Merrick was going to summarize everything he had heard from everyone, so I just, I think you just want to make sure you get everything out there so he can do that. So is there anything else you got for us?

Corey Niles [00:12:04] Okay, yeah, that's what I was.....sorry I was confused about you're trying to wrap it up. Well I do want to speak to the EAS and EWG Reports and I think they got it. And I think on the PDO topic, I think the general way it would happen is that the Science Centers and they talk with the SSC leadership and they figure out what's doable. I know as many have said, we're in a really uncertain situation here about what staff resources will be available, so I hope they will do their best to make that science topic review happen and, if possible, include the suggestions from the EIS and the EWG and ultimately up to them on what they're able to do enough work on to make work worth presenting to the SSC.

Brad Pettinger [00:12:58] Okay, cool. All right. Thank you. Okay. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:13:08] Thanks Chair. I think I heard what Mr. Niles just said that I'm going to put a finer point on the EWG recommendations, which is we had tasked them with doing a summary report around FEP Initiative Process 4. So they've asked for a flag for a meeting in September to do so, so just endorsing that, I realize that's still a ways off. And also we also heard from them about an ecosystem status report topic review around the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and the issues that were brought forward to us around its oceanographic power as an indicator and what that means for the report as well as science that goes into other parts of the Council process. So just flagging, I think that that is good to signal here that we agree that that would be a good topic for that meeting. Additionally, I think I'm mostly agreeing with folks around the table, but I just wanted to add perhaps a little bit of texture to this discussion about the groundfish flexibility and the connection with the IRA proposal projects. First want to thank Merrick and Council staff for pulling this all together after this week. I think these agendas look like they're on the right path to me. My sort of point I just wanted to make here is that the four projects, I think Mr. Lackey spoke to them in his testimony, and how that compares with the IRA project. I think it's number one around adaptive management, which we've been discussing about picking up in April to have a starting conversation about it, which is just a lot of the GAP recommendations while those four I completely understand where they're coming from and I think they may be good ideas. They are almost more of sort of pre-baked policy solutions as opposed to the scope and intention behind the IRA projects, which were about developing frameworks, applying to multiple FMPs, and approaching trying to find more broader scale solutions that require a process and them thinking to get to. So that's a little bit different than sort of what the GAP was proposing, which in my mind is a set of solutions but that's already been decided upon. So the pathway feels a little bit different to me. I am not opposed to thinking about that flexibility and what those four sort of solutions or policies, how they fit into that larger framework or might be part of that discussion, but I just wanted to note that I'm seeing those two things as a little bit different and hopefully we can have that discussion in April with maybe a little bit more thinking across the Council family.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:00] Thank you Corey, okay. I've got a hand up on thing and it's Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:16:14] Sorry, thanks. I forgot one thing Mr. Chair. And Corey, just responding to what Corey said there. I think that's, I think in my mind, Corey, what we would discuss in April. And I know the frameworks versus specific, I think what you're saying there I think my hope is that's what the discussion is about. And I had one specific thing on the June meeting which we can get to April planning, I would think, but it's I'm wondering why the Initiative 4, the risk tables are on the June agenda when STAR Panels don't happen until after the June meeting, some of them at least, but maybe that's just something we could take up during April, this agenda item in April.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:07] Okay, thanks Corey. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:17:10] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And I just wanted to respond a little bit to Corey Ridings. I'm so excited about the policy solutions that the GAP put forward, and I'd really love...I'm really excited for the opportunity in April to really discuss how those things fit into that broader framework. My first read, I said this the other day, but my first read of the first IRA project was exactly in line with those things. And I hope to have the chance to show, or I hope that our discussion in April can reveal to folks that, yeah, that that set of things is a suite, it could be part

of a suite of a lot of other changes that might be really beneficial to create flexibility for fishermen around these topics. So I know that they seem like pre-baked policy solutions but they're flexibilities in National Standard 1 that we've failed to take advantage of in this region. And so I think there are a lot of, yeah, and I'd like to talk about this in April too, but there are a lot of examples around the nation where they've employed things that are available to us, not, you know, it's not been reinventing the wheel necessarily but like just making sure that we, I'm mixing metaphors here in my head, but making sure that we have the tools in the toolbox to be adaptive. And so I viewed that agenda item as like, or that IRA project as checking in to see that we have everything available to us to make sure that we can respond to, respond to fishing communities and so that in my mind that doesn't preclude pre-baked solutions, it's actually like an additional demand for us to look at the solutions that we have already available to us to move forward. So I'm really excited for this conversation later when we get to in April and yeah, happy to pitch in. I just offer the expertise that I have from within NOAA to that effort however the Council sees fit.

Brad Pettinger [00:19:30] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:19:33] Yeah, thank you. And I appreciate this recent exchange. It's helping me think about what we would do for April. I still don't know exactly. I'll have to huddle with Kelly and Jessi and maybe some people that have worked in other regions of NOAA and maybe talk through what can we provide that's going to be helpful. But I think I understand where folks are coming from. And I think we do...I think there's value in holding on to the intention of the IRA work as we outlined it. I don't know there has to be a dichotomy between that and solving a more immediate crisis in groundfish. I think they could be very complimentary. That's just where my head is. So if you're okay with leaving it there, I'll work with my staff to figure out what what sort of constructive material and discussion we can tee up for April.

Brad Pettinger [00:20:21] Okay, very good. Christa Svensson

Christa Svensson [00:20:27] Yeah, no I'm supportive of that approach forward. I think it's encouraging to see that we are being adaptive in terms of something that was brought forward for workload planning from the GAP, which appears to be across the board since we heard from a number of sectors. I am really supportive Corey of your comments in terms of kind of an overarching framework and are there other pieces out there that could be included really is what I heard from you, not just hey, let's look at these four items, but there may be some other things when all of us have had a chance to think about this that could also be included that would be beneficial for groundfish. I do want to wrap the piece in Aja that you spoke to earlier this week about there may be some modality with the CPS fisheries in particular. I mean, maybe salmon, maybe HMS, I don't know. But I think when we're thinking about this bigger topic it would be helpful, particularly because we didn't really notice this for the other FMPs to get their ideas as well about what items could be wrapped into this that would move the needle forward for everybody. We heard this morning about salmon fishermen and the fact they're getting 10 fish, that's pretty potentially. I get we haven't set that season yet, but I mean there's a lot of people hurting and a lot of FMPs who are on their last legs. They didn't come forward at this meeting and I'm not going to try and make decisions for them by any means or recommend that we do that, but I do think it is admirable that the GAP came together on this, that we should really take a hard look at it and we should try and cover as many people as we can with an IRA project that was originally set out to do that. So thank you, and looking forward to talking about this in April, hopefully.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:26] Thank you Christa. All right. David Sones.

David Sones [00:22:31] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure where this might fit, but they're talking, the modeling people have been talking about having a common database that they can operate within the STT for inputs and outputs and as I understand it there's only a couple people that have that information. They might be able to spread out the workload a little amongst the other members that way. And then it's real important to document the modeling changes as they occur and get those out to everybody. And I don't know where we put that or just to get it into discussion or consideration.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:24] Thank you David. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:23:26] Thank you Mr. Sones. I took that as a question that you'd like to maybe understand where we consider that and how we can task that. There might be a chance we could just fold that into some of the usual salmon process. Maybe Robin can help us if she's willing before she retires, but help us think through it, not work on the database. I saw that look that she gave me. But, you know, I think about the methodology review process and things like that, and maybe that's where we could take up that conversation. I don't know. If Robin disagrees I'm sure she'll come to the table.

Brad Pettinger [00:24:08] She's still sitting down so I think she's good with it so. All right I don't see any hands on the screen or hitting the floor, so I'll turn to Executive Director Burden for a summary.

Merrick Burden [00:24:25] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I guess the only last question I have for you all? Any preferences on a Legislative Committee in April? If we think that's warranted?

Brad Pettinger [00:24:35] Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:24:40] Yeah, I'm just curious if anybody has any idea on how likely we are to get a request for a letter in the next four weeks in terms of comment on anything that's gone on? There's been a lot of, obviously, news around NMFS, et cetera. I haven't heard of anything, but that would really probably be the driver for if we wanted to have a committee meeting or not.

Brad Pettinger [00:25:11] Okay. I'd say John Ugoretz, but Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:25:16] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to think back to earlier in the week back under Open Comment and also under the NMFS Report we had a bit of discussion wondering about whether the progress on the 2025 stock assessments that are currently underway, whether we could get an update on the status and based on some concerns about whether we still had the capacity to complete everything that was on the list. We had a decent discussion and it sounded like NMFS would be able to get back to us with some information. There's no NMFS Report for groundfish in April, but I thought the suggestion was to come back in April. So just flagging that and wondering where that might fit.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:10] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:26:10] Yeah, thank you. Through the Chair, and thanks Miss Yaremko. Yeah we stated we would submit an informational report to April that would give an update for everyone.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:17] Okay, very good.

Marci Yaremko [00:26:20] Great, thank you.

Brad Pettinger [00:26:21] Okay.

Merrick Burden [00:26:28] All right, well Mr. Chairman I think where we're at is coming to the end of our discussion over schedule. One more thing to run by you before we conclude is the stock assessment review process RFP. That's also in your briefing book, and I think I'll, assuming you all are good to proceed with that, I'll hold until we have a congressional budget before executing on that project I think, but otherwise I'd just be looking for a head nod from you all that you want to proceed with that work? So hold that thought in case you need to think on it for a minute, but let me try to summarize where I think we ended up here with scheduling. So starting with April, very few changes for April. I think Miss Svensson's question, you know, are we going to get any questions? I don't know. Maybe we'll hold that as long as we can and if it looks like a Legislative Committee is warranted we can put it on our schedule for April. Let's see, otherwise the revised April agenda is pretty well set. In June, so we will proceed then with moving salmon off of the June agenda. We'll have the AS in-person, HMSAS in-person. I think the default is to also then have the MT in-person unless there's some travel restrictions on the NOAA side. I thought that observation was a good one. Let's see, other topics for June. That's all I've got there. And then we will work on April. We will come back with something for you on the adaptive management project and whether and how some of the groundfish flexibility needs fit in with that project. So what that looks like I'm not sure yet, but we'll have something for you. So that's where we landed on scheduling. And then, yeah, I just would like to turn your attention then back to that RFP and just see if we are comfortable with that and would like to proceed?

Brad Pettinger [00:28:50] Okay. I'll look around the table. Let's see, Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:29:02] Yeah on that I wanted to thank Merrick for his work on that. Very supportive of it going forward. We had some concern that the SSC and others had not seen it before, and Merrick met with Aja, Corey and I after the November meeting and took some viewpoints into account, and I know, more importantly, really talked to the Science Centers and heard in the Q&A with the SSC just now that the SSC didn't put anything in their statement but thought their concerns had been addressed, so supportive and thanking Merrick for the extra work he put into that in gathering input from people.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:49] Thank you Corey. All right, well I think we're good it looks like to me Merrick with what you got laid out so there we go.

Merrick Burden [00:29:57] I think we're all good.

Brad Pettinger [00:29:57] Okay, well outside of thanking staff for doing a great job running this meeting. I mean, pretty tough with all the hybrid stuff going on, hands off to the, or hats off to the IT folks back there in the tower of power. Anyway, fantastic job everyone and we'll see you in April. And one more thing we need to do. Chair Gorelnik, or former Chair Gorelnik.

Marc Gorelnik [00:30:35] You had it right the first time. I move that we adjourn this March 2025 Council meeting.

Brad Pettinger [00:30:46] Okay, do I have a second? Second by David Sones. Thank you. All in favor signify by saying "Aye"

Council [00:30:51] Aye

Brad Pettinger [00:30:52] All right. Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, meeting adjourned. Thank you.