

**COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS**  
**282<sup>nd</sup> Session of the**  
**Pacific Fishery Management Council**  
**June 11-16, 2025**  
Doubletree by Hilton Sonoma-Wine Country  
One Doubletree Drive, Rohnert Park, CA 94928

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

## **Contents**

Meeting Transcript Summary .....	3
A. Call to Order .....	4
3. Agenda .....	4
B. Open Comment Period.....	5
1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items.....	5
C. Administrative Matters .....	6
1. Council Coordination Committee Meeting Update .....	6
2. Legislative Matters.....	9
3. Fiscal Matters.....	10
4. Approve Council Meeting Records .....	15
5. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures .....	17
6. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.....	21
D. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP).....	28
1. Presidential Executive Orders and Administration Updates.....	28
2. Council Response to Executive Orders and Administration Updates .....	32
3. Research and Data Needs – Final Action .....	68
E. Groundfish Management .....	70
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	70
2. Limited Entry Fixed Gear Actions: Gear Endorsements, Cost Recovery, and Other Administrative Changes – Final Action.....	73
3. Inseason Management – Final Action.....	77
4. Adopt Stock Assessments - CANCELLED.....	91
5. Intersector Allocation Review – Final Action .....	92
6. Phase 2 Stock Definitions — Final Action .....	95
7. Harvest Specifications Flexibility - Scoping .....	123
8. 2027-28 Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Planning.....	133

F. Highly Migratory Species Management .....	140
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	140
2. International Management Activities.....	141
3. Exempted Fishing Permits – Final Action .....	144
4. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap Development .....	146
G. Habitat Issues .....	153
1. Current Habitat Issues.....	153

## Meeting Transcript Summary

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

## **A. Call to Order**

### **3. Agenda**

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right, we have the deal to deal with the agenda so Looking to Sharon Keifer. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:07] Mr. Chairman, if we are ready to approve the agenda I have a motion. I hope it's arrived.

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

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:22] There we go. I move the Council approve a revised agenda for the June meeting as presented in Agenda Item A.3 with the modification of moving item D.2 from its current place on the agenda to between E.7 and E.8.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:41] Language on the screen is accurate?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:44] Mr. Chairman, it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:45] Very good. Seconded by Vice-Chair Hassemer. Thank you Pete. All right, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

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

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:51] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Fantastic. Moving right along.

## **B. Open Comment Period**

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

No transcription for this agenda item.

## C. Administrative Matters

### 1. Council Coordination Committee Meeting Update

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:00] So Mr. Chairman I will stop there. I'm happy to take any questions about the CCC Report.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:09] Okay. Questions on the CCC Report? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:14] Thanks Chair. Thanks Merrick for the update. My question is actually on the last part around the aligning Council and NMFS priorities, and you spoke to sort of one of the efforts that's going to be done here on the West Coast. And it sounds like, I think you said you're still getting meat on the bones or something about how that's going to move forward. How involved do you see this Council in that process? And sort of like, are there any next steps that we should be thinking ahead to? Or kind of, I guess, anything we can do that can sort of support you and NMFS in doing that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:52] Merrick.

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:52] Yeah, I appreciate that question Miss Ridings. What I....the process I have in mind is that I will probably come back to you with questions. And where I think we'll start from at the Council level is to say, you know, it is fortuitous that we went through that whole Committee-of-the-Whole process and we said what are our core responsibilities? What are, how do we organize ourselves as capacity or resources decline? And so that really tells us where we need to prioritize and that's where I intend to start from, and then that's how we have a conversation with the Science Centers and the Region who are going through, at the moment anyway, a larger capacity reduction than we are. So I'm sure from there I will come back with questions about more granular level detail about where you might have more prioritization or more interest just to make sure we keep focusing and keep prioritizing and aligning with those offices. So all that is to say, I think if you don't mind just waiting for a little bit, I appreciate the offer to help, but I'm not sure how you would help at this moment. Let us go through the exercise and get some more clarity.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:09] Thank you Corey. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:12] Thank you. Mines I guess in a similar vein on the priorities, I was hoping at some point here this meeting we would be getting an update from NMFS, and maybe it's still coming, on what they do see as their priorities, a listing of number one, number two, number three, or even the top five even if they're not there, to help us with that. Having been on a call recently with leadership from NOAA and leadership from the state agencies, Miss Quan was very particular in exactly what she said the priorities would be but I haven't heard those anywhere else other than that meeting. Mr. Kurland from Alaska said his priorities as well, which were pretty much in alignment. But with the reduced capacity from NMFS and the new EOs and new guidance, when are we going to get that update from NMFS on, these are the five things we have to prioritize right now to help with this discussion. And I don't mean to put Mr. Wulff on the spot or Executive

Director Burden, but it seems we're missing a piece of this discussion. Maybe that's going to come out of this work that's happening, but it doesn't quite seem to match up.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:29] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:03:29] Yeah, I'm having to respond to that now. I was going to wait and see if anyone had other questions of Merrick before, but it sounds like we're into discussion. Appreciate the comments Miss Mattes. I mean, it's something we're having a lot of discussions at with the agency right now. I think there was a little bit of waiting from, the phrase I've been using, the dust to settle a little with all the departures. We still were waiting, a pending potential reduction in force work plan that was coming out on top of that, right? So there was still some potential large dominoes to fall. But we are at a point now where, you know, we have seen a significant reduction. We have seen that it is already going to impact our ability to do business as usual. So we are at a point where we're starting to ask those questions internally of really what are we going to prioritize? What do we have the resources to address? And where are gaps in addressing just even the priorities much less? And then also what are the impacts for the things that are not prioritized? So we are actively doing that at this point, and I think the reason why you might not have heard a clear definition or answer from us is because of the things we're discussing at this meeting. You know, we do anticipate we will be prioritizing a number of things that come out of these Executive Orders, and part of that is to get input from the Council and the public of what they think we should prioritize and we do plan to take that into account. So I think you'll hear from us as best we can as we go throughout the meeting. Just acknowledging it'll be probably a little bit iterative. You know, like Sam said, we may change our mind based on the feedback we get. We may vault things higher or lower based on the feedback we get, but we're ready to have some of those discussions and can do so as we discuss things throughout the week here. In regard to this particular, since I have the floor, the Council Coordination Committee Report, you know Merrick noted the West Coast pilot project, if you will, is one of the few ones that are initially, and to Miss Ridings question, I think I would expand from NMFS perspective that one of reasons we put ourselves forward for that pilot project is because a lot of the work that's already been going on here at the Council and in the West Coast. In particular, Merrick mentioned the risk matrix that was laid out there that was in direct response to this. We are managing too many stocks and we don't have the ability from a scientific side to support that, so we really need to do a deep dive into what stocks we are managing, look into removing some from the FMP. Looking at, you know, additional or new complexes or EC species, and all of that was stuff already on the Council's agenda and stuff you are going to be discussing now and then in September. So that's another reason I think we put that forward as to be part kind of the priorities because we felt this Council was already a step down the line in doing this, in looking at some of the exact things that we thought would help us in our overall prioritization for a number of reasons. So I hope that's helpful. If you have specific questions that are on one issue versus another I'm happy to try and answer them, but hopefully that at least gets some base of response.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:55] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:06:55] Thank you Mr. Wulff. And you remind me I should have caveated this, that the first thing Miss Quan did say is these are my priorities this week, next week it could

change....(laughter)... So I appreciate that, that it is still fluid. That's not a detailed answer, but it's the answer you can give right now, so I do appreciate the time and the flexibility to ask it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:24] Okay, thank you Lynn. All right, anyone else? Okay, I think we're done with this agenda item and we're going to take a break.



## **2. Legislative Matters**

No transcription for this agenda item.

### 3. Fiscal Matters

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, and I believe that I'll open the floor for discussion. So, Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:00:07] Thank you very much Mr. Chair, and thanks for all the hard work on the budget. I just want to note that it's been tremendously helpful to have Katie Westfall working with us on HMS. Thank you for taking care of that gap, no pun intended, and we hope that that will continue.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:30] Thank you Rebecca. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:30] Thank you Chair. Since I seem to be the one who starts a lot of the discussions on tough items. I'm not on the Budget Committee but I sat there and listened to the intense, tough discussions that happened. We are in a tough spot that I don't think any of us want to be in. Even with our planning and the work we had done ahead of time, some things are outside of our control. And as much as it pains, likely pain all of us, I do think we need to take some actions now so that we aren't in a worse place next year. Being remote for our advisory bodies is not ideal. We made it through, through COVID. There was some hiccups for sure. But if we maybe have a little pain in September of our advisory bodies being remote, maybe then we can be in better shape for November and going forward. And I know it's going to be hard on Council staff having a vacant position. Not that anybody could replace Kit Dahl easily, but even just having another body there is tough. And then finally, speaking to the state liaison contracts, I noticed that is not in the recommendations from the Budget Committee, which I appreciate, but I know it's been part of the discussion. And as was mentioned in the report, the states are in bad shape too with our budgets, and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to absorb some additional workload or some additional salary. We contribute far more staff hours, man hours, FTEs, whatever the terminology is for it depending on who you work for, to this process than what we get paid for. And we as an agency are happy to do that because it benefits our communities and our fisheries, but even trying to absorb two months of FTE for somebody right now would be extremely difficult given the budget situations within the state, so I'm glad that's not on the recommendation at the moment although I'm sure it's still out there. So just some opening thoughts.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:57] Thank you Lynn. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:02:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. I appreciate the Budget Committee's recommendation and this is a very difficult place to need to get to, but it's my understanding that this really is the only choice available. Following up on Jaime's comment, I just want to note that looking at the Draft September Agenda and the scheduled Saturday afternoon groundfish assessment presentation, I agree with her remarks that there's huge benefit in that presentation environment for a lot of Q&A and discussion between members of various advisory bodies including the SCC, the GMT, the GAP, and oftentimes usually one or more members of the stock assessment teams. So that's unfortunate that we'll be remote for that particular activity. It really is an important discussion and actually brings about a lot of efficiencies to have the opportunity to

have those discussions in that setting. So I'm sad. I guess I would also just say I understand that our special project funding is almost fully committed. We've received it all and we have plans for spending it and contracts have been executed and such. But in my mind, what we get for the 90 grand in terms of engagement from our stakeholders and our advisors is probably the best money that we spend. So as I think about that and this, you know, the gravity of the decision here, I'm.....you know to me it's unfortunate that this had to be the priority for cutting, but I do support the recommendation. Thank you.

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

**Butch Smith** [00:05:07] And I hope, I don't want to put a monkey wrench in any of this because I understand the levity and the importance of this. But back in the old days before Zoom advisory bodies used to have conference calls, and it used to be a week or so before. Now this is a real important meeting to the groundfish, but say there would be the oddball salmon on the agenda, and so what they would do is we'd have our meetings ahead of time and they would send the Chair to the meeting to give the reports and ask the questions. And my thinking is could we think about, and I don't know what the expense of this may be, be a hybrid of the hybrid where we would have the pre-meetings where the groups would get together and then the Chairs or the Vice-Chairs would be able to participate at the meeting and give their testimony where we.....I do too think coming from the subpanel world the importance of our constituents and the people who are on those panels are very important, and not only just to read a report, but get the flavor of watching them do it and interacting is invaluable in my opinion. I might be the only one that feels that way, but in my opinion it's invaluable. So maybe a thought to think about. I don't know what that would look like obviously in budget but, and I think not all would have to take that offering. The most pertinent to the agenda obviously might want to do that if it was possible, but if it put us in some kind of, I don't want to put the Council in a financial bind by any means, but maybe that might be kind of a solution in between what we heard from Miss Diamond and what I kind of gleaned from Marci and the importance. But that's the way we used to do business instead of bringing the whole SAS down on a....they would bring the Chairman down on a non, what we call a non-salmon type meeting. An oddball meeting we called them for the salmon people, not an oddball meeting to anybody else so. Watch your words Butch. A lot of people have your cell phone number. So anyway, it would just be a maybe a solution or maybe something to think about In the....you know for the September meeting or in the future under these tough times. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:02] Thank you Butch. Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:08:03] Yeah, thank you. I'm in alignment with my colleague from Oregon in terms of appreciative of the recommendations and making sure we don't end up in a tighter bind next year by taking proactive steps this year I think is important. I am going to weigh-in on the vacant staff officer position. I'm fine with that being open until the budget is known, but I don't want this to turn into a we don't need a staff officer because we haven't had a staff officer. Katie has done an admirable job and the quality of work is the equivalent of having a staff officer. Kerry has done a remarkable job. And again, the quality work is that collectively of having a staff officer. And so when this project wraps up and Katie is no longer there, we will likely need more of a staff officer position than we currently are needing based upon the fact that we have a contract that we are getting that support on. And the second component of this is that our staff officer has

historically supported the person that is working as our representative to WCPFC. We have the benefit of my attending in that position currently and being able to get that support through the organization that I work for on a day-to-day basis. That is unlikely to be the case for anybody that would be moving into that role. So your ability to rely on somebody as a scientific advisor, and I spoke to this when we decided we were no longer going to send our staff officer to international forums, I am concerned that long term if we do not have that seat filled you will not have somebody that is working in the international arena that has the ability to get the information that they need through the Council process. And by not mentioning it in this position it's just too easy to say, oh, we haven't had one for a year or two years or three years we don't really need that. We need it. We are relying on the funding and the grace of others to get us through what is a trying time, but we do need to make sure that when we budget in the future it does include the space for fully staffing one of our four FMPs.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:50] Thank you Christa. Anybody else? Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:10:58] Having not attended a remote meeting I can't exactly say I'm looking forward to it, but I do understand the need and appreciate the discussion and the Budget Committee's recommendations. I'm certainly not wanting to cut off conversation, but letting you know Mr. Chairman I do have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:25] Thank you Sharon. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:11:25] Thank you. Just want to weigh-in here a bit too. I really appreciate the discussion at the Budget Committee meeting earlier this week, even though I was only there for about a half an hour of it, it was a good conversation, and thank you Executive Director for considering the input we had around our state budgets. It's a serious situation that we're dealing with at home and the ability for at least our agency to absorb reduced funding in the state liaison package would be really challenging, so thank you for considering that. I do appreciate how hard it is to keep a vacancy position open. That's part of the strategy at WDFW too before, we do a lot of other things before we have to look at reducing staff, and I know that's not a place where we want to go. I appreciate how you're flying the plane. This is really hard. And I just wanted to comment on Butch's idea that maybe a hybrid of the hybrid. I have the benefit of being able to chat with the Chair of the GMT about what it might look like to bring Chairs and Vice-Chairs in-person. And, well I think it's a good idea. I know the GMT is already spending a good chunk of their time preparing for the Council meeting in advance through the pre-Council webinars and that sort of thing, and so hearing that it might not be as beneficial as we might think. And so I just think it'd be a little bit more challenging, but I appreciate thinking about ideas like that and bringing them forward, just because it seems like we're going to have to do things differently if we find ourselves in this situation next year or the year after. I support the recommendations. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:52] Thank you Heather. All right, looking for hands. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:13:56] Thanks Chair. Just reflecting on the comments that have been made before about sort of the importance of the dialogue around the groundfish stock assessments. Just looking at the proposed meeting agenda for September and thinking if all the advisory bodies and management teams were remote then.....throwing this out, if we were to move things up by a day

so that the SSC and possibly the GAP and GMT didn't overlap as much that there might be ability for GAP members, GMT members, to be able to attend the SSC meeting. And perhaps that's just a matter of some thoughtful agenda design for those advisory bodies, but in the spirit of trying to find overlap so that those folks do have some time, a little additional time given it might be remote, if that could be a possibility. Definitely turn to Council staff if that works or not.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:02] All right, thank you Corey. Anyone else? All right, looking maybe for a motion I heard, maybe?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:15:17] Mr. Chairman, if we're ready I do have a motion. The tower of power should have it, yes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:26] All right, there we go. When you're ready.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:15:26] Mr. Chairman, I move the Council adopt the recommendations presented in Agenda Item C.3.a, Supplemental Budget Committee Report 1.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:36] Okay, the language of the screen appears accurate?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:15:39] Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:41] Okay. Seconded by Butch Smith. So thank you Butch. Please speak your motion as needed.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:15:50] Mr. Chairman, I believe that Patricia's report did an excellent job. As you heard around the table, there was quite a bit of discussion at the Budget Committee meeting and recognition that tough times require tough decisions. I'll leave it at that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:13] All right. Any discussion? Questions on the motion? Not seeing any, okay, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:16:22] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:23] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Very good. Any discussion? All right. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:35] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just one last item. I know at the end of this meeting it's possible somebody might want to say something about Mr. Gorelnik. But in the context of the Budget Committee, I want to thank him on behalf of the entire Budget Committee because I failed to do it during our meeting Thursday for his, I think five years of service to the Budget Committee. I know he was forced into the first three by virtue of being Chair and you're automatically there, but when that was done, he didn't have to, but he served another two years on the Budget Committee and really appreciate his commitment to that and input. So again, on behalf of the Budget committee, I just want to thank you there for your service to the committee.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:27] Thank you. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik.** [00:17:28] Thank you for that recognition, but please don't associate my service with our current budgets predicament.....(laughter)....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:33] Looking for a scapegoat there. Okay, and with that, Patricia, how are we doing?

**Patricia Hearing** [00:17:45] You have completed your hard work today about minimizing our budget impacts. And I'll bring more information to you in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:53] All right, fantastic. Thank you.

#### **4. Approve Council Meeting Records**

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That will turn us to C.4, which is the approval of Council Meeting Records. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:07] Mr. Chairman, if a motion is appropriate, I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:12] I believe it is, please.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:14] But I did not want to cut off discussion. I don't see the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:18] I see no hands.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:25] Let's see. I don't see the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:25] Has the motion been received? No?

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:34] I sent it like three days ago and you sent me, oh, sorry. Yeah.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:40] Okay. It'll be here shortly....it will appear.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:50] Take a minute and try and resend that email. Let me get to that. There it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:02] Out of the ether. There you go. Please. When you're ready.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:01:19] Mr. Chairman, I move the Council approve the Council Meeting Records for the 280th session, which was March of 2025 meeting, and the 281st session records that April of 2025.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:37] Okay, the language is accurate. Do we want to reference the C.4? Doesn't matter? Okay, Very good.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:01:46] Yes sir.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:46] Second? Seconded By Rebecca. Very good. Please speak your motion.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:01:53] Mr. Chairman, obviously no one made objection to the content of the meeting records and so they should be approved.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:05] All right, fantastic. Any discussion on the motion? Okay, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:02:15] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:16] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Well we're moving right along here.



## 5. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right, well the Council task is going to pop up here in a second and we'll just go right down the list so. Okay, the task is before you so we'll start from the top and I'll look for a hand. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:22] I think you have a motion for Item 1.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:24] Okay, please.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:30] I move that the Council appoint Mr. Pete Hassemer as Council Chair and Mr. Butch Smith as Council Vice-Chair for the August 11, 2025 to August 10, 2026 term.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:40] All right, thank you Aja. Second by Heather Hall. Thank you Heather. All right. So please speak to your motion Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:49] Thank you so much for your lovely service in the Chair role and for the time that you put in as the Vice-Chair. I'm really looking forward to serving under Pete as the Chair and excited to have Butch join the rank of Vice-Chair. So nothing more to say. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:05] All right, very good. Okay. All right. All those in....I'll call for the question. Oh, Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:01:14] I don't get many opportunities now so.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:18] Oh.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:01:18] I want to say that I've enjoyed both your service and Brad's done a great job. I won't be on the Council to miss you as Chair but I'll still miss you.....(laughter).... And Pete, I know that you're going to do a fabulous job. And again, I'm looking forward to the color that Butch will bring to his service as Vice-Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:50] Thank you Marc. I think we're in good hands for the coming year for sure. So okay, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:02:01] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:02] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay I'm out of a job. Pete.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:11] Well, rather than save it for later, maybe if I can just offer words. I mean I'm really honored by the ability to do that. It's a big role. I'm grateful for the confidence the Council has in me as I think about that. It's just not two handfuls of votes or whatever, but I think your vote represents a huge network of things on our coast, people, harbors, boats, resources out there, communities, livelihoods, and that's the role I have to take on. So again, your confidence in my ability to work with the leadership team is really appreciated. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:59] Very good. All right. Well it has been an honor, I'll say that, to represent all of you in this position. So okay, good stuff. As far as Number 2, we're going to hold off on the appointments till after the Council appointments happen and that would be in Pete's hands. Onto three, number 3. Looking for a motion from Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:03:33] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I do have a motion. I move the Council appoint Miss Aja Szumylo as the Council's representative to the Joint Management Committee to the Pacific Hake/Whiting Treaty.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:50] Seconded by Butch Smith. Thank you Butch. Please speak to your motion Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:03:55] Thank you. Yes, really appreciative of Aja's interest in this position. The whiting fishery is really important to the state of Washington, to our Council. We look forward to collaborating and supporting her in this new role.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:17] Very good, okay. With that I don't see any hands. I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:04:25] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:26] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion unanimously. Congratulations Aja. Okay, moving down. Appoint an EC representative and designee. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:04:47] Mr. Chairman I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:50] Okay, wonderful. We like motions here.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:04:54] I move the Council appoint Deputy Assistant Special Agent in Charge, Eric Morgan, as the primary National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Law Enforcement Representative on the Enforcement Consultants. Mr. Brian Corrigan would be the designee.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:10] Okay, very good. I'm looking for a second. Seconded by Vice-Chair Hassemer. Thank you Pete. Please speak to your motion as needed.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:05:20] Mr. Chairman, if NMFS has confidence in him, I've got confidence in him.

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

**Council** [00:05:34] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:35] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. All right, thank you. And next up will be I believe Ryan Wulff. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:05:51] Yeah, thank you. I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:58] Okay.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:05:58] I move the Council appoint Miss Megan Mackey to one of the National Marine Fisheries Service positions on the Groundfish Management Team.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:06] Okay, thank you Ryan. Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Thank you Sharon. Please speak to your motion Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:06:14] Yeah, thanks, I'll be brief. Miss Mackey has over 20 years of professional experience in fisheries and natural resource policy. And for the last nine years she's been working for either the Alaska Region or the West Coast Region, and has varied experience in rulemaking, fishery actions, and Council processes so she'll be a great addition.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:35] Very good. Okay, thank you. All right, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:06:38] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:39] Opposed no? Abstentions. All right, the motion passes unanimously. Wonderful. Okay. And then I'll move on to Number 6. And that would be Sharon Kiefer. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:06:59] I have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:03] There we go.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:07:03] Mr. Chairman, I move the Council appoint the following individuals to the At-Large positions on the Scientific and Statistical Committee. Dr. Selina Heppel, Dr. Alberto Rovellini, and Dr. Francisco Werner.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:18] Okay, thank you. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. So please speak your motion.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:07:24] Mr. Chairman, it is really.....we talk about the professionalism of this Council, and it is gratifying to see a response in kind from our applicants. This was a robust group, a very robust response to our call and all of these individuals had wide experience. But as I reviewed the CVs I returned back to what we heard from the SSC, a very strong desire for stock assessment support. All three of these individuals have that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:09] Okay, Thank you Sharon. All right, look around, no hands. All right, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:08:17] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:18] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Rebecca Lent** [00:08:21] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:24] Okay, thank you. And then that motion passes with one abstention. Cool. Very good. There we go. Okay, and then right now I'm planning on appointing Kevin Godes with the SAS and Arlene Merems to the Habitat Committee? If anybody has any discussion about that, but that's kind of where I'm leaning, so Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:03] Thank you Chair. I just wanted to make sure it's all out there. Arlene Merems, who has been recommended to be on the MPC for the Habitat Committee, she does work for ODFW. ODFW does have somebody else on the MPC and Arlene has actually been filling in while Miss Watson was on a job rotation. I do not think there would be a conflict of interest. I believe Miss Merems would be doing a great job of representing the Habitat Committee were she in this role as opposed to Miss Watson, who would be representing ODFW. So just wanted to make sure that was out there in case there was any concerns about conflict of interest.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:47] Okay, very good for transparency, absolutely. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:09:50] And similarly, I'd like to make a record. Kevin Godes, who will be subject to the Chair appointment, has served briefly but exceptionally on the Salmon Advisory Subpanel and he'll do a great job.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:04] Good. Thank you Marc. Okay. All right. Okay, Kelly how are we doing?

**Kelly Ames** [00:10:12] Thanks Chair Pettinger. You have successfully completed all of your appointments under this agenda item. I won't recap them. But I did just want to look around the table and get the concurrence to re-advertise for the Tribal GAP position. So we'd have that close and available for your consideration at the September Council meeting. I see some head nods so good to proceed. All right, thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:38] Okay, well very good. Alright that concludes C.5.

## 6. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] So with that, that takes us to Council action, which is before us. So I'll open up the floor for discussion. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:10] Thank you Chair. It's getting late in the meeting and my eyes are very tired. Just trying to....I should have asked this earlier, clarification on the September QR Agenda? To me the SSC is bolded indicating they would be in-person, is that correct? And then I'll have a follow-up.

**Merrick Burden** [00:00:33] Thank you for the question. Yeah, that's correct. The bold format indicates who will be in-person. And so you see like an in-person SSC, Budget Committee, the Groundfish Assessment Presentation would be both.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:54] Okay, like I said it's just, my eyes are very tired and I wasn't positive I was seeing the bold. And then on the Groundfish Assessment Presentation, since I know that will be of interest, not just to Council members but to GAP and GMT members, I think you just hinted at that, that that may be available hybrid, both in-person and for people to listen in online. I think that'll be an important opportunity. Just trying to get a little better idea on the plan if that is what it is. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:27] Thank you Lynn. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:01:27] Yeah I just want to mention, thank you Chair, that we haven't heard any news yet about the timing of the Take Reduction Team. I assume it cannot be any later than December from what I understand from the National Marine Fisheries Service. Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:47] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:01:47] I want to continue discussion here. Give me a second and I can follow back up shortly. Just give me a second.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:52] Very good. Okay. Anybody else? Caroline McKnight.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:00] I didn't hear an answer to my question. I thought the stock assessment thing was going to be available online as well as in-person. I didn't hear an answer, I'm sorry.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:10] Yeah, I'm sorry, yeah. Merrick.

**Merrick Burden** [00:02:13] Yeah, I didn't realize that was a question. I thought it was a statement. But yes, I can confirm that, yes, that would be a hybrid setup so we'd broadcast it so people can listen in.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:35] Okay. Okay. Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:02:35] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Outside of the September and November agendas, I did want to come back to a request that was made earlier in the meeting under the inseason item for a special or earlier SSC Groundfish Subcommittee meeting to possibly review the quillback stock assessment earlier than the scheduled August 11th and 12th meeting. I just wanted to flag that for Council staff consideration. I just didn't want that to fall off the list, so a request doesn't necessarily need a response unless Executive Director Burden needs to.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:15] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:03:15] Yeah, thank you. We have not forgotten. What I would suggest we do is work through these agendas and dispense with this, and then we can come back to that question about the quillback review as well as there's a question about 2026 projections, and so we're prepared to speak to that. But I think probably best to focus on these here for now.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:39] You've got another question?

**Caroline McKnight** [00:03:40] Yes, thank you for that response. I did have another question, but I think maybe I'll start one piece of the September agenda item, but I wanted to make sure Ryan had an opportunity to answer. If he was ready, I'll wait.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:00] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:04:00] Yeah thanks, sorry. To Rebecca's question just to quickly address that. Yeah, we have committed to sending a notice to establish the team by the end of October, but convene the first team meeting by the end of November, so prior to December. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:18] Okay, thank you Ryan. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:04:22] Thank you. Related I think to both meetings, just noting that we did mention that we were going to bring up COP 20 under the FIW agenda item for September in terms of potentially bringing language back. So I'm wondering if the hour that we have currently budgeted for that agenda item is sufficient for anything that we might need to do? So more of a just a heads-up there. And then as a part of that, one of the recommendations that came forward was that we would potentially move our EFP cycle to a November and March, in which case we would likely want to shade an EFP topic in the November meeting for HMS based upon that decision. So kind of a placeholder there on that one.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:24] Okay, thank you Christa. Okay, Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:05:25] Thank you Chair. To the GMT Report, their request of some of their scheduling for September. With the GMT being remote they have some specific requests on timing partially to accommodate I think the NMFS members of the team not being able to work or not having access to their offices and computers on the weekend. So I'm hoping Council staff can work with the GMT leadership to pencil out what days work best for them to accomplish their work, given some of the limitations on participation, or Mr. Wulff may be telling me that something

different on work availability, but I just would request that Council staff has the opportunity to work with GMT Leadership to schedule their meetings to help them succeed on their work.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:29] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:06:29] Yeah, sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off Lynn. I was just going to say we can do that. And NMFS is getting more flexibility to participate virtually for Council meetings in particular as one of the exceptions, international meetings as well that are outside normal business hours, but we can work with what you just said. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:53] Thank you Ryan. All right. Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:06:53] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I just want to echo Lynn's comment. And thank you Ryan for the clarification. I interpreted the GMT statement to mean really two things. It was one, it was front loading the days, not just because of a potential restriction on weekend work, but also just for extra time to coordinate a heavy workload associated with stock assessments and gearing up for our specification process. So I'm just noting that while the GAP Report didn't echo that, I would hope that there would be a lot of continuity between them to allow for that coordination ahead of time. I do want to target in specifically on one agenda item right now on the groundfish portion for Monday, September 22. It's G.4, the Initiative 4 Risk Tables. I'm of the understanding, but I'm welcoming some discussion around the room, that the risk tables are already integrated into the stock assessments and therefore don't need an independent standalone agenda item, that that will be covered under G.3. And if there's any ancillary or additional information that needs to be considered, it could possibly come in maybe as an informational report or some other avenue rather than an independent agenda item. And I'm bringing that attention specifically because, you know, we've identified this meeting's going to be remote. As one of the former GMT members who lived through remote-land, it is very challenging. So that to the degree we can provide as much focused on needs for the team and advisory body attention, I think that's in everyone's best interest. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:39] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:08:39] Yeah, thank you. And I guess thinking about the similarities between Agenda Item G.3 and G.4, my thinking is that it makes sense to keep them separate. And the reason for that is that they're functionally different decisions that we're potentially making. So adopting stock assessments, you know, the SSC will bring you a BSI determination. There's very little for the Council to do under that agenda item. Initiative 4, the risk tables, this is a convergence of the science that's coming through some of these assessments as you referenced. But then perhaps more importantly for this body is what do we do with that? And so that's a policy discussion. So what is our response to that uncertainty or to that risk? And that's something that we haven't discussed yet. And so to me those are different decisions and it makes sense to keep them as separate agenda items.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:40] Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:09:40] Thank you for that response. I think carrying that out a little bit further, I think that the decision or information can, should or could be processed along with some of the flexibility measures. And so maybe there's a time in the future where that might make more sense or might allow for a more comprehensive discussion on how they fit in. But again, just a thought. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:04] Thank you Caroline. All right. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:10:09] Thanks Chair. I just wanted to note the request from the SSC for the Economic Subcommittee to meet ahead of the September meeting to provide input around the Trawl Catch Share Program Review.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:26] Okay. All right, anybody else? Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:36] Thank you Chair. It seems like there was a lull. I did have one suggestion for November if we're ready to go there. I don't sit for HMS, but was asked to relay the request to unshade the roadmap, HMS Roadmap in November, unshade that. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:15] Okay. Who else? Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:11:15] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Again, not to pick on risk tables specifically, but I'm also getting hailed on back channels that for the November meeting G.6 for salmon, the Initiative 4 Risk Tables, while the EWG did recognize that the work is complete, there was a lot of recognition about the staffing loss, both at the National Marine Fisheries Service and on the STT. And so there was a big flag as to whether or not the right advisory bodies would be available and fully staffed to appropriately weigh-in on that particular item. So I do want to flag that as potentially removing, noting there's still time to discuss that in September, but making that clear that there may be more benefit in waiting until everyone is staffed. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:11] All right. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:11] Thanks Chair. Just noting with what Miss McKnight just shared, I don't disagree with anything she said. Just I think I would prefer, if possible, to keep it shaded for the agenda and address that in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:41] Okay. A little sidebar discussion. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:12:41] Sorry, I was just told that I misspoke. I think I said I'm agreeing with Miss McKnight which is keeping it shaded for now not removing it and then in September we can address to make sure. Before September we can figure out if we have the right people, if NMFS has the right capacity, and if November's the right time, but just keeping it shaded on the November agenda so we can address that in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:07] Okay, fair enough. All right, I think we're getting close here. I can feel it in the air. Oh, no, Corey.



**Corey Ridings** [00:13:26] I get it. Thank you Chair. Just really briefly recognizing from the GAP there was a request to add a marine planning item to the September agenda, and they specifically talked about a potential draft PEIS for the Aquaculture Opportunity Areas. This is something the Council has had a lot of interest in the past so just want to flag depending on how that moves forward over the summer. Just flagging we want to make sure that the Council does have an opportunity to take a look at that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:01] Okay. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:14:02] Yeah, thank you. I would appreciate maybe a little, just a confirmation that that's what you want to do? Because we've gone back and forth on what to do with the Marine Planning Committee as wind energy has kind of died down here with the Trump administration and our staffing issues and things like that. So if there is a desire to have a marine planning conversation in September, just maybe a a little more confirmation from you all that that is what you want, or the alternative is leave it to a QR Letter process or do something else outside of the Council meetings. So I just want to....hearing what Miss Ridings is saying and just I want to explore that a little bit more with you all.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:48] Okay. Everybody good with that? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:14:56] Thank you Chair. I was hoping my little gremlins in my computer were going to be popping up and telling me what to say here. I have suspected, just given some of the stuff with the current administration, that we would be having a bigger-picture discussion about the Marine Planning Committee. Is that a body we still need? How often do we need it? Those resources, are those resources better used elsewhere? One of the little voices in my computer is saying a QR could be a QR and would not need to be an agenda item, but the MPC could meet before the meeting and wouldn't have to meet at the Council meeting, but it could have maybe an online meeting and help develop a QR Letter. But I suspect, as I started to say, this may develop into a bigger picture discussion about the role the MPC has given the change in priorities with the current administration. Hopefully some of that rambling made some sense.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:57] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:15:59] Yeah, thank you. It does make sense. Let me just put a finer point on my question. Mr. Kerry Griffin is helping the FIW push forward and then he would take up the marine planning exercise if we did do that. So if we pick up marine planning, I mean a QR Letter is no light lift. That takes time and energy away from the FIW and do you want to do that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:33] Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:16:33] Thank you. I guess I'll just note that decision was just made here to, in the spirit of cost savings, to not fill an open Council staff position, which means less staff is doing more. And so I think someone over here to my left said, you know tough positions mean tough decisions. And so I'm not necessarily seeing this is an immediate need but I'm happy to hear more. But I am also trying to be very sensitive that we're stretched thin anyway and there's a tipping

point for everyone in terms of how much we can be asking staff to do and engage in. So happy to hear more though.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:26] Okay Caroline. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:17:26] Yeah, I'm going to weigh-in on this one because it really is coming down to staffing and you heard me speak earlier about the need to long term be mindful of it. I would prioritize the FIW in this case simply because it is part of an FMP, and marine planning is important. And I certainly have relied heavily on them in terms of making motions related to wind energy. I don't think that it is specifically related to aquaculture, although that has certainly come before us in terms marine planning, and I do think we may want to consider QR Letters, et cetera, as the need may be. But we also had a letter, I believe it was in public comment, with regard to mineral and offshore rights. And so while we may not be taking it up between now and September, longer term we probably are going to need to continue thinking about how best to utilize this committee as the needs change, right? We were using the MPC heavily with regard to wind energy, but marine planning is not only about wind, it's about anything out there that impacts fisheries. So I do want to put a spoke in for MPC and the need, but if I have to prioritize between the two and pick children I will pick the FIW for this next meeting.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:09] Okay, I don't see anybody shakin' their heads. All right. Okay, anybody else? Going once. Anybody else? Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:19:26] Did we come to a conclusion on the quillback issue or were we going to come back to that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:33] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:19:34] Yeah, I would say let's let's get through the agendas here and then we can bring up the quillback and the 2026 projection question.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:45] Okay, so on the agendas we're good for now? All right, fair enough. Is that part of this agenda item? Or is it afterward? All right, we'll just go move into the quillback situation.

**Merrick Burden** [00:20:02] Yeah, I would maybe look to Miss Ames and see if she can just walk you through our latest thinking and exploration that we've done on those two questions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:12] Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:20:12] Yeah, through the Chair, thank you Executive Director Burden. We have been kind of light on our feet hearing the request of the Council at this meeting for both the 2026 projections for canary, petrale, and shortspine, as well as an earlier SSC review of the quillback California assessment. So given kind of how our Council meeting overlapped over the weekend, we are just having some good email dialogue with the SSC about what that will take. We're working on getting all of those steps coordinated, but our plan for California quillback would be the process outlined in the Terms of Reference whereby we have a Groundfish Subcommittee

meeting to review the STAR Panel results and then a subsequent SSC review. We are asking the SSC whether it is possible to have their review prior to September 18th, which is the earliest on the current schedule that we would have them convene. I know they are discussing what is possible and assessing availability, but I believe we will be able to accomplish the Council's objective there. Once we get the date identified per normal process, we'll put out a e-blast and let you all know what that date is and how to connect to that meeting. We are also working through what is needed with regard to the 2026 projections for canary, petrale, and shortspine. So I believe that request will also be achieved. Just need to get all of those pieces in place. So making good progress. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:59] Okay Kelly, thank you. All right. Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:21:59] Just a comment. Thank you very much Council staff and subcommittee meeting people who were responding to emails, and NMFS and Council staff, everyone. We just really appreciate the quick jump here to help support the inseason action that we took and just want to express gratitude for that. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:24] Okay. All right. Kelly, how are we doing on this one?

**Kelly Ames** [00:22:28] All fine from my perspective. I'll look to Executive Director Burden to see if he has what he needs.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:38] Okay. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:22:38] Yeah, and appreciate the discussion. I did make a few notes. We did have....let's see, looking at November 1st I made a couple of notes around the G.6, just looking into staffing changes or challenges rather, and whether we could pull that together in November so that's already shaded. I think it makes sense to keep it like that. I did....your request to unshade the HMS Roadmap discussion in November, and there is also question about EFPs. I wasn't able to track all of my emails about that, but here we will resolve that one. Let's see, looking at the....where did that go? Oh, and then looking at September, I also made note of a question about whether an hour was enough for I.4. We think it is. Usually that agenda item takes about 30 minutes. The COP consideration there that's coming out of the HMS Roadmap is pretty, should be pretty specific, so we're envisioning an hour being sufficient there, but we can always take a harder look at it. Other than that Mr. Chairman I think we are doing pretty well. Oh, I also did make note of a question about the ECON Subcommittee meeting in September. That's related to a budget question. We would need to renegotiate the contract with Northern Economics at this point, so I think it makes sense to look to November for that. That would integrate a little more seamlessly into the workflow. So not dismissing that idea, but just trying to time it so we don't have to renegotiate a contract and spend more money that we're not trying to spend. So happy to take any questions or things that I've missed, but otherwise I think we're in a pretty good place.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:34] Okay, very good. All right, with that, that'll conclude D.6, or C.6.

## **D. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP)**

### **1. Presidential Executive Orders and Administration Updates**

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] That takes us, or finishes up with public comment. I guess we have Council discussion, but this is really setting us up for D.2, so I'll just open the floor for any discussion you want to have here before we move on. Okay. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:22] Sorry to delay this Mr. Chair, but the NMFS guidance to Executive Directors. I was hoping we could get a little more guidance on the guidance anticipating on tomorrow or Sunday, whichever day it is, we're going to need to come back with something and trying to determine what that something is. I was fortunate enough to be able to listen in on quite a bit of the North Pacific Council meeting which was in Newport last week and Council member Nicole Kimball produced a motion for this for them that as one who's made many lengthy motions with lots of pieces, this one kind of blew my mind and I thought I was going to have a nosebleed from it, and I'm trying to figure out if something similar is expected from us? Are we expected to fill out that table? Just some better guidance on expectations for what we are going to come back with on Sunday or what is expected of Council members to come back on Sunday, because it could go anywhere from trying to fill out that table to providing a bullet list. Some sideboards or additional information would be helpful.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:37] Okay, Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:01:38] Through the Chair, thanks Miss Mattes. I do want to highlight one difference between the North Pacific and what we have in front of us here today is, the North Pacific was relying upon a document prepared by the agency. So they were, you know they had many more materials in front of them upon which to make that motion. Here we are proposing a two-Council meeting process. So under D.2, where you have known priorities, those should be established and pointed out to us. The other part of that would be providing some guidance for us as staff to take back and help with this prioritization exercise to give you materials in September to make that decision, prioritizing the items that you have identified. And then the last thing I guess I would say is, you know we anticipate staff tasking under D.2. So what are the things as Council members you would like staff to bring back to you for consideration in September? And we would envision working closely with National Marine Fisheries Service to ensure that what we bring forward meets the Executive Orders along with the deregulatory Executive Order. And then I guess I'd also just look to Executive Director Burden if he wanted to anything else.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:00] Okay. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:03:00] Yeah, thank you. I could add a little bit to that. I would just reiterate Kelly's point that we are looking at a two-meeting process, so we'll come back in September for packaging this all up before we transmit it back to the agency. But for what it's worth, I think it's helpful, the structure of the North Pacific motion was really helpful in that it's saying we have motion or activities that are now underway, which one of those align with the Executive Order? You know I look at our Year-At-a-Glance and I think, well there's a lot of things in there that do.

And then we have our prioritization process or things that are not quite yet underway but are further out on the YAG, a lot of those align with the Executive Order. The thing that I think will probably be the most challenging is are there new ideas or new things that you want to, that you have in mind to pick up at some point, and we'll hear from our advisory bodies later in the week about some of those things, and that's part of the staff tasking that you could ask us to do and bring back in September so you can add to that list before we transmit. So I would think about it in those three parts with that third part probably being the one that's most challenging. The other two we can, while I'm sitting here right now and jotting down that list, so hopefully that helps Miss Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:04:19] Thank you Deputy Director and Executive Director, that really does help that in my mind now we have until September to fill out that template and that spreadsheet. I don't have to go try to figure out how to fill the spreadsheet between now and Sunday. So that is very helpful guidance and much appreciated.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:33] Thank you Lynn. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:04:36] Thank you Chair, and thank you Miss Mattes for raising that question. I was concerned about the criteria. So we're going to put out this list of potential items and then we'll find out what the criteria are for determining whether those items are in sync with the Executive Order. So any kind of hints as to what meets or doesn't meet....it'd be nice if we had the criteria now while we're making the list. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:05] Okay. I'm sorry Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:05:05] Thank you. Step two involves taking the list that will come up in June and saying, do these really meet the EO? Are they in alignment with the EO based on some criteria that you'll be developing? Are those criteria come from headquarters? Is the Council doing that? And what do they look like, just so we make sure we're not going down the wrong list. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:36] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:05:37] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And Dr. Lent if I'm understanding the question right, in the Situation Summary we've requested that you all develop criteria that says here is why we think these things are important, because we will have to come back and establish a prioritized list in September and say, here is how we prioritize these actions that we're taking to align with the Executive Order. Prioritization is really hard unless we're doing it objectively and saying here's the criteria we're using to measure our priorities. So we're asking you all to say what matters to you when you think about these topics that align with the Executive Order. That allows Kelly and I to do some work over the summer to say, okay, here's how we filter through all of these based on the criteria you've given us. Kelly, if you want to add to that?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:29] Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:06:29] Yes, thank you. And just to add to that, you know the SitSum does highlight the criteria from the Executive Order. So those criteria are already out there, stabilize markets, improve access, enhance economic profitability, and prevent closures. So that's where,

you know, I'd recommend starting with that framework, thinking about that as you look at the Year-At-a-Glance. The groundfish measures you've previously prioritized. The CPS measures you've prioritized. Then thinking about how those measures address, you know as Merrick said, helpful to think about what we already have on the table, what we know is coming down the road that you believe you would like to do and how that fits in those bins. And then what are the new ideas that you have that maybe we haven't yet scratched the surface on and how do those fit into the Executive Order criteria as well as what you deem to be your prioritization criteria.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:36] Okay, thank you Rebecca, Kelly. All right, anything else? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:07:42] So yeah, thank you, that was helpful Lynn and Rebecca, and Merrick. I think you're already going to start doing this, but yeah, I think we heard some ideas from Mark and Mike on the CPS preventing closures and even broader on that. And I'm curious about what Rebecca was getting at with Q&A on the level of playing, level the playing field? We've been wondering about that for years with swordfish. So it sounds like we're going to hear that kind of idea come back in a couple of days and then it's going to get refined in September. So I think that was helpful. And yeah just reflecting on really quickly here that something Sam said, I'm going to take it out of context I'm sure, but he said something, I think it was the EFPs of like, let's be less bureaucratic. And I think one of the frustrations we've had at this Council is that things do seem once they get passed here to be overly bureaucratic. There's many layers of review that we don't understand. And I don't know if O&E was going to catch that one, so I just, or how that fits in, but I do think that's something that should be part of the focus of these discussions as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:01] Thanks Corey. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:09:03] Thank you Chair. And Corey I want to jump on that because I also think there are a number of processes that are here within the Council that are bureaucratic. It's not just, I mean yeah, I spent a lot of time on the NOAA side of things. I think there are things there that, you know believe it or not they try to do things in a very streamlined way, but I think there is a way that the Council itself contributes to the bureaucracy as well, and so particular to the EFP process, that's one where the Council has added on its own additional process that is, yeah, it's another layer of bureaucracy that isn't necessarily required either. So I just, yeah, I don't want to reflect that all on the agency. I think the Council itself should take some, like this body when we meet together, not the Council itself as it's doing its work to come back to us, but we need to consider what we bring in front of this group and what actually needs thought and consideration and streamlining things.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:03] Thank you Aja. All right, I'm not seeing anymore hands. Kelly, how are we doing here?

**Kelly Ames** [00:10:14] Thanks Chair. I believe everyone has been sufficiently briefed on what the expectations are under the Executive Order and how we'll proceed into our discussions under Agenda Item D.2. And just what to offer I am here for the rest of the week, so happy to answer more questions on the sides about how you might be thinking about the D.2 action items. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:39] Thank you Kelly.

## 2. Council Response to Executive Orders and Administration Updates

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Public comment is done on D.2 and now we're going to Council action, the task before us, so I'll open the floor for discussion or motions, I mean I'm easy. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:15] If folks are willing I can start with some motions just to like get us launched in a direction and welcome discussion after that. So if you could prepare the first motion that I sent. So for this motion, I move that the Council offer the following unprioritized list of ongoing and upcoming regulatory actions that meet the EO goals as a preliminary list to be finalized at the September meeting. The Council should prioritize actions that reduce regulatory burdens on the fleet while maintaining stock health and conservation objectives. And I've binned this in terms of items that are in-progress and I'll go into other categories later but for the In-Progress Category: There's the IRA special projects, and that includes decision-making for stronger communities. Flexible and adaptive management. New fishing opportunities within bycatch allowances. Under groundfish that includes the Cordell Banks action. LEFG follow-on actions. Groundfish specifications flexibility. Groundfish stock definitions. Inseason management. EFPs. The biennial specification cycle. Whiting Treaty implementation. And the independent evaluation of our stock assessment process that the Council has contracted for. For CPS, that includes sardine stock definitions including reviewing use of parameters like EMSY and distribution in the Harvest Control Rules. Exempted Fishing Permits. And then annual harvest specifications. For HMS, this includes the Roadmap. Exempted Fishing Permits. International management. And the biennial harvest specifications process. For salmon, this include updating conservation objectives. Inseason management. Annual season setting process. For Pacific halibut, The Catch Sharing Plan and annual regulations for recreational commercial fisheries. And inseason management. The next bin is actions that are planned either from past prioritization efforts or anticipated actions. And then there's an "in" at the end of that parenthetical statement, I'm wondering if you guys could delete that. Sorry. And the rest is fine. For groundfish, this includes the trawl follow-on actions, particularly those that reduce cost to industry, and so I listed a few cost reduction programs or cost reduction options there, including evaluating cost recovery, the economic data collection and observer coverage requirements. Midwater rockfish, moving the midwater rockfish EFP into regulation. For CPS, this is the science and management priorities identified at the April, 2025 Council meeting. And then near-term inseason catch accounting for sardine to rectify any mismatches between the stock definitions and what we're actually counting. And then for cross-FMP I've listed EFP streamlining across all FMPs through the Council Operating Procedures. All the relevant elements from the Council's recent process refinement efforts through the Committee-of-the-Whole. And then marine planning to manage current and future impacts to fisheries, so looking at offshore wind, aquaculture, seabed mining, and oil and gas exploration.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:49] Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:03:52] Yes.



**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:52] Okay, very good. Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. All right, please speak to your motion Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:04:00] Thank you Chair. So one thing to make clear from the beginning is this is an initial list. We're going to come back in September once we've had time for initial input from our advisory bodies and other stakeholder groups on ways to expand and refine this list. The recommendations here come from the Year-At-a-Glance, the advisory body reports on this agenda item, and then from other statements that I found. So one example is the GAP statement from E.7, but then also the information from the April 2025 Council meeting about CPS priorities as an example. Could include others that I'm unaware of right now. So this is a call to bring that information forward for inclusion in this list. It also includes.....oh actually I'll drop that. And then I want to speak in particular about, and yeah sorry, I was looking at the wrong rationale list. My intent here is that this set of items can fit easily into the template that NMFS provided to the Executive Directors for responding to this Executive Order, so it's, again, establish actions that are easy to draw from and quantify in some way. I want to call out one thing with EFPs. I listed EFP streamlining across all FMPs under the cross-FMP bin. And I want clarify that this includes the parts of the Fishery Innovation Workgroup efforts, and then other parts that were discussed under the Council efficiencies work. Ideally, I'd like to see any process efficiencies that we develop for EFPs extend to all of our FMPs rather than to be dealt with on a FMP by FMP basis. Right now I see a lot of differences between the requirements that are listed in the COPs and the requirements that are listed in regulation for what is necessary to submit for EFPs. And then I also note that there's, I noted this in the discussion under HMS the other day, but I don't see a lot of strong discussion and alignment with the required NMFS process that's there for moving forward EFPs. So I'm looking for a harmonization to make the entire process, including the NMFS side of it, very smooth. And I think the rest of the items, the other items are pretty self-explanatory, but welcome additional discussion from folks as we move forward. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:34] Okay. Questions for the motion maker? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:06:40] Thanks Chair. Thanks Aja. You mentioned briefly the advisory body team reports. Is this intended to be.....actually tower of power can you scroll back up to the top? Just looking at the bucket that you've included here, I think you were very specific about this list of actions ongoing and upcoming. Does this include the things that would fall within sort of that preamble there that came from our, I think we had four advisory body reports?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:14] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:07:14] Thank you Chair, and thank you Miss Ridings for the question. So I kind of, I should note I have another motion coming that addresses a couple of other things that aren't in the already developed bin or need a little bit broader consideration. So the second motion that I have is more of a future wish list and some of the categories that I made kind of bridge across some of the concepts that came up. So one example is the Ecosystem Work Group Report this morning highlighted the risk tables. I think that there's room for discussion and consideration of those in this....oh, sorry for hitting the mic.....in a, inside of a bin that I put in the second motion. And so I tried to be very general. In that description later, this list is very specific to items that we have that are like actions that, or that are in the hopper for the Council to take that can be added to

that table very easily. The broader list, again, is more inclusive of some of the concepts that came up. The broader lists under the second motion is more exclusive of some of the concepts that came in some of the reports.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:29] Okay, thanks Aja. Thank you Corey. All right, further questions? Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:08:35] I don't know if it's questions, but hoping I could see the middle of this motion just because there's a huge pile there. Thank you. Sorry, you're scrolling really quickly for me...(laughter)... You want to scroll down a little bit more? Perfect for CPS, HMS, and then salmon. And I think this might actually be a question in terms of collective thinking here. We mention international management essentially under groundfish and under HMS, and I'm just wondering for things like salmon or halibut where we may have interaction if we want to include those as well? There was a fair amount of discussion, just for folks involved in this process and listening, about where kind of to put international management. And the reason that I'm bringing it up is that the Council process really is where we give one, members of the public an opportunity to weigh-in and input, but we also send representatives to those forums to help negotiate for really better opportunities for our fishermen. So just a general question to the group here about these two in particular. Thank you for scrolling slowly for me. And then when we get to discussion I do have a little bit of discussion about EFPs.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:22] Thanks Christa. All right, Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:10:22] Thank you. That is a really good point. I don't know as much about the other FMPs and so I forgot those items should be included there, but yeah this should, the international management aspects of all the FMP's or all the species that we work with should be coming through in this one as well. So do we need to edit this in any way to include those in the list or? Okay, what is the process for editing?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:55] Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:10:55] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I would be happy to make an amendment. And I'm going to just put a really simple amendment on here that says to include language related to international management for salmon, CPS and halibut as needed. Was that too quickly? I saw a wave of arms. Okay hold on here. So it would say, to include language regarding international management for salmon, CPS, and halibut as needed. And before I close this I'm going to ask one question, because I see Dr. Lent has her hand raised. If I have missed an FMP please shake me down, but I have tried to include the FMPs that we have so I will pause there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:23] So HMS we're good, right?

**Christa Svensson** [00:12:28] Yes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:28] Okay. Questions for the.....Rebecca?

**Rebecca Lent** [00:12:30] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And I guess this is completely out of order, but Aja it sounds as if, and thank you so much for the motion, it sound as if there's a complimentary or another part of the package and I worry that if we, without seeing that second package, are we going to be trying to add stuff that's in the second package. But I imagine you can only take one motion at a time Mr. Chairman so I'm just going to live by the rules. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:58] Okay. Okay, looking for a second? Seconded by Aja. Thank you Aja. All right. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:13:07] I'll just speak briefly. I am familiar with groundfish and HMS much more so than salmon, halibut, and CPS, and so in providing sort of vague language around international management for those three FMPs it will be my intention to include things like treaty negotiations, et cetera. I'm not saying we need to get into the specific details. I'm just suggesting that I don't know them well enough to know specifically how to phrase those international management concepts and would be looking to staff to help get the language in there. But the intention would be that we would cover those actions for all of our FMPs and fisheries and fishermen.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:04] Okay. All right, any discussion? If not I'll call for the question. All those.....oh, Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:14:13] Sorry, just really quickly, do you mind going up to the top? I just missed reading the very beginning.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:23] We have an amendment, not the motion.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:14:24] Okay...oh, this is the amendment. Sorry. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:31] Okay are we good with that? So this is for the amendment. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:14:34] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:34] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, so now we're back to the amended motion and so discussion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:14:50] Thank you Mr. Chair. I will definitely be supporting the motion. I just want to thank the motion author for the inclusion of inseason management in so many of our categories here. Inseason is one of those things that is kind of the bread and butter of what we do and is yet so important to ensure that we are managing effectively within our annual catch limits, but yet it's a process that allows for flexibility that allows adjustments to things routinely like trip limits, bag limits, areas that are open and closed. And for those of you that have never participated in the inseason process for salmon, it is quite a thing. I mean there are about 40-ish inseason actions that are taken every year. Those changes to the rules allow us to do things like rollovers of impact neutral quota for our species of concern, so it does really allow us to maximize those stocks that we're looking to utilize, but within the established constraints. Similarly for groundfish, we're

familiar with our inseason groundfish process. We do have it on our agendas pretty much every meeting. Also wanted to note the inclusion here of perhaps coming soon CPS inseason catch accounting. So I do.....you know it's not really a glamorous topic very often, but inseason is just so fundamental to what we do. So I just want to acknowledge that. Thank you for including it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:41] Thank you Marci. Anyone else? Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:16:45] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you again Miss Szumylo for the motion. I wanted to go back to salmon for a second. One of my favorite expressions is fish gotta swim. I got an email this morning from a constituent who is going out today to rescue some small fish that can't get to the next part of a dried up river. We can't forget about water and I'm sure we have to be judgmental about this or careful, judicious, not judgmental. We're not judgmental. There is this Executive Order wiping out the previous memo that said let's balance fishing needs with other needs for water. What are we going to do about salmon if all that power is going to one or two of the uses? So how do we pack that in here? Help us make for healthier salmon stocks by considering the water that salmon need. Maybe Mr. Wulff can help us find a balanced way to bring this up. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:56] Thank you Rebecca. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:17:56] Yeah, thank you Chair, and thank you Dr. Lent for the question. It sounds like there are more motions to come and more discussion, and this one the way I read the beginning of it is very focused on upcoming items that are on the Year-At-a-Glance and on kind of plan for Magnuson or Council-focused regulatory actions under their FMPs. That said, so I'm not sure if that will fit in this motion the way it's constructed, but this agenda item is the place to start to put something like that in the record. You heard from Sam, and the EOs here are very broad, it is very well within the Council's purview to make comments on other EOs or other aspects of this EO that might be different than your specific FMP and Magnuson actions. I think that is very relevant for the Council to put forward views on. So this would be the agenda item. I'm not sure it fits in the way the motion is constructed, if that's helpful.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:59] Thanks Ryan. Kelly.

**Kelly Ames** [00:19:00] Through the Chair, thanks Dr. Lent. I also just wanted to notice that on the Year-At-a-Glance we do have Essential Fish Habitat Phase 1 review for salmon, which often is kind of the first time where we have the opportunity to look at the conditions necessary for salmon. And so that is something that is planned for this Council, though it is shaded pending resources.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:26] Thank you Kelly. All right. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:19:27] Not related to salmon, related to EFPs since I mentioned it before. Firstly, I will be supporting the motion. I am encouraged to hear around the table that we may be interested in harmonizing, I guess is how I would phrase it, our EFP process. Just for a little bit of history here, when we first raised the topic, and it was really a long time ago, people were not interested in doing that, so it is encouraging to hear that, hey, looking at how we are doing timing to get EFPs moving quickly for all of our fisheries would be beneficial. And I think having the

FIW might be a good place to start. So thank you for the motion and for the consideration of EFPs for fishermen.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:23] Okay Christa, thank you. All right, Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:20:27] Thank you Chair. I just wanted to thank the motion maker for taking this on. I think by some of my questions earlier in the week I was very overwhelmed on how to even approach this one, so thank you for taking that on. Additionally, representing a state agency it seemed a little awkward to be trying to take the lead on this type of a motion, so really do appreciate it on several levels. I know that you reached out to a lot of different people, looked at the the advisory body reports, et cetera. I think this list is fairly comprehensive and a pretty good place for us to start and will be supportive. And just again, I really appreciate you taking this on so that the state folks didn't have to and get put in a weird position.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:15] Thanks Lynn. All right, I don't see any more hands. I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:21:22] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:23] Opposed no? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Very good. Thank you Aja. All right, Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:21:32] I have another motion that starts to look a little bit more, a little bit further afield. And yeah, well I'll speak to the motion after but, I move that the Council tasks staff to use the following guidance to explore additional opportunities to stabilize markets, improve access, enhance economic profitability, and prevent closures. In addition to the list below, staff should look to ideas from recent NOAA guidance documents including the....or as an example, the National Seafood Strategy and events such as Managing Our Nation's Fisheries for ideas. For items identified as national and international, task the Executive Director with coordination through the Council Coordination Committee. Include an assessment of both staff workload and potential impact to industry according to the EO metrics. And so I divided this into regional, national, and international. Here's where we're going. So for regional. Cost reduction measures for industry, and examples include VMS efficiencies. I think in the GAP Report they listed turning off VMS and changing declarations at-sea. Cost recovery regulations at the regional level, not those that are in the act. And then monitoring and reporting requirements. The next bullet is data collection, improvement and expansion. So evaluating ways to incorporate fishermen collected data or data from citizen science into stock assessments. Looking to purchase from other regions, such as the South Atlantic Region Citizen Science Program. Data collection innovations already included in the Council's research and data priority list, and I linked to the research and data priority lists that we moved forward yesterday. Evaluation of all regulations established more than two decades ago. Evaluation of hatchery program production to see if science is matching initial program goals. Evaluation of the Council's approach to scientific uncertainty and risk, including evaluation of the risk of overfishing and of the P STAR sigma framework. Evaluation of timing and frequency of stock assessment evaluation processes, and an example is increasing the frequency of catch-only projections. Evaluation of the Council's approach to management uncertainty, so evaluation of management uncertainty buffer frameworks across FMPs. And then fishing level

recommendations for preventing overfishing could be established for multi-year periods, such as on a rolling average of catch versus ABC basis. And then just a catch-all for additional measures to provide flexibility across fishing activities. Onto the national list. So these are items that are outside of our Council purview to change on our own without coordination with other regions. So Magnuson-Stevens Act evaluations, including the cost recovery provisions and revisions to the National Standard Guidelines to support the EO goals. Create support of domestic infrastructure. So this list includes port infrastructure, processing infrastructure, fleet capitalization, and programs such as education or loans to bring young fishermen into the fleet. Market our industry support mechanisms. So access to USDA programs for food production or farms for fishermen, such as grants and insurance and access to capital. Stronger NOAA fisheries marketing of the primacy of U.S. fisheries management and how that contributes to a superior product. U. S. seafood commodity marketing support, similar organizations like the Genuine Alaskan Pollock Producers. And then support for product diversification or business incubators like an organization called Hatch and what Positively Groundfish presented during open public comment. And then on the international level. Leveling the playing field for international products. So this....could you delete the, "may require national/international level coordination". I think that that's covered in the tail. So equitable tariffs and quotas. Foreign fisheries impact on U.S. Production. And then engagement with the Seafood Trade Task Force that I think is listed in the Executive Order. And then improving nationwide communication to USDC seafood inspection approved establishments when their seafood export changes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:11] Okay Aja, is the language on the screen accurate?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:26:14] Yes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:14] All right. Looking for a second? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Thank you Christa. Please speak your motion.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:26:21] So just like the other motion, this is a preliminary list and it is sweeping intentionally. And again, this one came from recommendations from a lot of different places that we put together. The list of national and international level items are things again that I hope that, or that I think that are relevant to our national or to our management in the Pacific region, but outside of our purview to affect ourselves. I think it's really imperative here to make clear to the administration what real material support for fishing industry looks like and includes, and that there's a large role for support that the government can play outside of the commerce department and that extends into other parts of the executive branch. And then I'm hoping that Council leadership engages with the CCC at the national level about this. And then the regional items are a wish list of things that have come up in a lot of different venues that are obviously big things to tackle, but are things that I think address the broader goals of the Executive Order. And yeah, I'm open to starting to talk about these items. I don't mean to cut anything off the list and welcome everything else that comes into it. This isn't, again, meant to be inclusive or exclusive in any way. It's meant to a starting point for what I hope will generate a lot of discussion through public comment that we take leading up to the September Council meeting. I'll stop there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:57] Thanks Aja. Questions for the motion maker? Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:28:04] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Aja, could you give me a little more insight in regards to the bullet under regional evaluation of hatchery program production to see if science is matching initial program goals? A little more insight in terms of the actual expectation or intent of that language?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:28:24] Thank you Miss Kiefer. I am going to phone a friend in salmon world. Again, this list is not mine. It is a list that came from a lot of folks. So if I can call on my colleague to tell a little bit more about the intent there that would be really helpful.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:40] I think that would be Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:28:44] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you Miss Kiefer for your question. We've been going under some of these hatchery plans and the science that's now getting to be 20-plus years old and I think that, or the new science that's 20 years old, I think it's time that we start asking the questions both from our co-manager friends and us, is what we are doing is what we intended to when we thought these programs were working and there are some programs that are not, at least in my opinion and some others, performing like they were intended, and some of these should be looked at both co-managed and at the state level to make sure that we.....you know we, some of the these plans were at seven to ten generations of Chinook, 15 generations of coho and they're simply not performing like they thought they would 20 years ago. So it's kind of time to maybe take an evaluation of those programs. Some are working, however, but some are not.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:16] Thank you Butch. Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:00:00] Perhaps it would be helpful then, I mean as stated it just says hatchery programs. It doesn't say salmon. So....and also, I guess, to me when I look at this list that's the one that jumps out as really not seeming to be within the Council's purview. Certainly a review of existing where there have been evaluations might be a first step of that rather than just globally taking on the whole shebang. And also understanding that many of these hatcheries have specific goals that were highly negotiated. You know there's a lot of things that go into that, so I just, I'm a little concerned that that's a big, big, big element that the Council may not gain much from.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:59] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:59] Thank you. I just want to respond directly to that. Everything in this list is wild. Like your statement that this is outside of the Council purview, like I think many of these things are far beyond what we can affect directly like, or even that NOAA can affect directly. But the EO asks for, you know, what does it look like to.....like it asks, if you scroll up to the beginning of the motion, the EO asks for, you know, looking at stabilizing markets, improving access, enhancing economic profitability and preventing closures. And so to me what that really looks like is beyond....what I think the administration is not getting is that it doesn't, it's not just that they're stifling regulations that the Councils are putting into place through NOAA, it's that we do not have a comprehensive program for addressing the system of management for these fisheries. And so I, yeah I agree with you totally that it's probably way outside of, way outside of what we can do or what we should be doing, but I don't want to lose the opportunity to paint a really broad picture of what success would include.

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

**Marci Yaremko** [00:02:16] Thank you Mr. Chair. Following from that discussion I guess I'm wondering why this is a motion and wondering about the very first sentence, I move the Council task staff to explore additional opportunities for these things. And you've just described that most of them are out of our purview, so I just am thinking about, you know, what is it that we are actually wanting staff to do and bring back to us? And just wondering why you didn't elect to use guidance or, you know, you've mentioned these things, you know this is a wish list and it's large and big and outside our scope and I just am trying to understand the goal here with putting this forward as a motion. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:23] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:03:23] I was told to do that but, that's some of it, but I would love to hear a little bit more, yeah I defer some of that question to the Council, to Executive Director Burden to talk a little bit about, yeah, how this helps you guys move forward with the ask in the Executive Order. I guess one thing that I wanted to say or reiterate again is some of this is the start of gathering ideas, and for this specific list it's gathering the comprehensive list of ideas of things that support the objectives that the EO put forward. So I don't mean for this to be the end of the discussion, I mean for it to be a starting point for the discussion. I actually heard from the advisory bodies this morning in our delegation meeting that they were looking at the ask in a very different way too because of timing constraints for addressing a lot of the other workload that we had at the Council. And then, and honestly during the week as I was building out this list it ballooned into becoming a wild list. But I think that we, if we're being asked then we should be really honest and wide, and that's why it is this wide so. But in terms of how it goes forward, some of my vision was, again, if we put out a starting list people will come back at us with more information to add. And then I'd love the Council's feedback on this, but my thoughts are that It's not, I'm not expecting staff to like develop how this happens, I'm expecting staff compile the list. That's what....I think that the list, in this case the regional things, I think there can be some prioritization and paths forward to working on, but the national parts of it that are much further sweeping are a list that communicates back to the administration what our needs are. I'll hand it over to Executive Director Burden to talk more about guidance versus a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:26] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:05:29] Yeah, thank you. And let's see I've got a question back to you, but I've got a few things on my mind. So one, Miss Yaremko I did suggest that we take this up through motions. Oftentimes if things are not clear consensus it's hard for me to just take guidance if there's disagreement on the floor, so sometimes the motion is just easier. So I advised a few folks that were thinking about this item to make a motion rather than offer guidance. I do have a question about your motion Miss Szumylo, if that's okay? So as you indicated this is the first step in a two meeting process. And so the second meeting would be to essentially fill out the spreadsheet that's an attachment in D.1, and as part of that is here's how we prioritize the things that we're going to do, and so this is a extraordinarily comprehensive list and I don't think I'll surprise you all by saying there's no way we could do all of it, right? And so I'm curious to know from your mind what you would like to see from us, because over the summer we can do some thinking but we



can't flesh all of these ideas out between now and September. And so I'm just curious to get your vision about what you would expect us to bring back in September in response to the list that's here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:08] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:07:08] Thank you for that question. The first motion I think fits neatly into the table in the template that NOAA, or that NMFS provided to the Councils to fill out. I don't think that this list fits neatly in that template. I think this list is...I think that that list is putting things into that template reduces again the...it's reductive. It supposes that the answer to the, again the stabilizing markets, improving access, all of that is limited to what is in our purview, and so the reason why this got to this place is we just started to think more about what could be helpful to meet those objectives and the list ballooned. So what I would hope after this with this really sweeping, with this really sweeping motion is to have for, you know, some indication. I added this line of discussion of staff workload and potential impact to industry according to the EO metrics. I want that really to focus more on the regional aspects than, rather than the national, or the national and international aspects. I think those are more guidance to you to take back to the broader discussions that are happening across the country. But for the regional list it would help to have some thought on like what does it take to do this? What does it look like to jump into this consideration? So I'm thinking in my mind of the groundfish workload table, the workload agenda item that we do periodically where that has like a discussion of just quickly like, do we think this is a high effort thing versus a low effort thing? There's some things on this list that could be low effort. I think all of them are high. But having some like quick thinking from staff about what potential this has to support industry and how hard it would be to lift these things off the ground in the future would be, I think, helpful for us to think through in the future how to start working through them. I don't expect this list to be prioritized necessarily either because it's so much bigger than the set of asks that are in the first list. And then, yeah I guess as we're talking about them, and as I'm saying this aloud, like the VMS efficiencies, cost recovery regulations at a regional level, some of these things may come up under the follow-on actions, as an example. Like I think that it's pretty reasonable to think that that set of cost reduction measures for industry may come up for the trawl fishery through the trawl IFQ 5-year review discussion, but I think that those items also may bear some fruit for some of the other fleets as well, and so part of why I put this here in this list of like desires and future looking things is that we don't have them on the docket yet. We don't have, or I'm not aware of plans that we have to evaluate those kinds of things for some other fisheries where they may be helpful. So hopefully that helps a little bit. I'm happy to entertain more questions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:30] Okay, thanks Aja. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:10:30] Thank you Mr. Chair. As I read through the stated objectives of the EO and the idea of stabilizing markets and preventing closures, I'm thinking a lot about the work that I do back at home beyond work in the Council arena, and one of the top things on our current work plate is administration of fishery disaster relief programs and the interest that at least our fishery stakeholders have in maintaining stability, keeping their operations going, receiving some direct payment to ensure their boat is maintained and, you know, available for future operations

when the fishery stock is replenished. So I'm just wondering did you think about disaster relief in the context of this list? It seems kind of a natural thing to be on here. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:58] Thanks Marci. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:11:58] Thank you. Yes, Butch said that to me earlier today and it's something that I wished was on there. I would welcome a friendly amendment to add that to this initial list, but I also....you know I think that if the guidance is to like look out into the ether of thoughts that are supportive, so yeah, I guess a question to Executive Director Burden, do you want us to amend this list in the way that we did the initial motion or just here? I completely agree with Marci and would love to see that explored in the national bin, but I don't know whether we need to add it to this motion since it's like such a bucket of things as it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:46] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:12:46] Well just as a matter of procedure, I don't believe a friendly amendment technically exists. So if you wanted to add something either take it up as a different motion or amend the current motion would be my recommendation.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:09] Okay. Rebecca. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:13:14] Thank you. This is on a different topic. I don't know if there's thinking about the amendment. I don't want to preclude anything there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:22] Okay. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:13:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm going to not make an amendment. There are so many things that I think could be on this list and I'm still kind of concerned with the top part of what this motion directs be done. So, you know I just, I think I'm hesitating to want add more here for fear of leaving some things out. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:02] Okay. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:14:02] Thank you Chair. I know it's partially due to the language and the specificity of the EO, but both of these motions are very commercial fisheries heavy. There's very little reference to our recreational fisheries. There's overarching things like ACLs, et cetera, but as we move forward maybe we can be thinking about ways that our recreational fisheries, our charter companies, our bait-and-tackle shops could benefit from this as well. I don't have any ideas off the top of my head, but I had been thinking about it previously and then when Miss Diamond gave her testimony that reminded me that I should probably say something that, see if there's a way we can leverage any of this to help our recreational fisheries as well. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:56] Thanks Lynn. Okay. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:14:57] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And appreciate that comment Lynn, and I'm just going to talk about it in the context of how our morning delegation went. Like thinking about

this there's probably a lot of good ideas that haven't been included on here, but I'm also looking at the SitSum and thinking about where we're trying to go and what do we need by September to meet the deadline. One of the things that's identified is how, you know, providing our recommendations on criteria to identify what goes on these lists and maybe prioritization and that's a lot of work too. I think it was intended to happen over the summer but I'm recognizing that we haven't really talked about what does that look like, and that kind of goes back to Sharon's comment about should that salmon hatchery thing be on this list and, you know, maybe if we had a criteria established..... So I'm just sharing some thoughts about how I'm getting a little bit overwhelmed with this and please help me if I'm overthinking it. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:18] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:16:18] Yeah I just wanted to add, I don't think I'm correct necessarily on how to do this or this list. I put this motion out there for thought and for work from you all. So I welcome....I'm not...if the way I'm approaching it is too expansive, like I welcome that thought. I'm not....I tried to compile the ideas that were out there. So that was what this effort represented. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:41] Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:16:41] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Can we go back to the top for the motion language rather than the list language? Okay. So just a couple of points. Firstly, there's specifically in this motion that in addition to the list below staff should look basically elsewhere. And I think that that, at least from my perspective, gives us the opportunity to include things like disaster relief, water, salmon hatcheries, et cetera. I am going to speak for a couple of minutes here on why I see the need for both the national and the international components that were included, and I realize that they are not exactly in the scope of the Council. But I would also say that stabilizing markets does not fall within the purview of the Council. So there's a little bit of awkwardness on this topic just in general based upon what we are being asked to do and that it doesn't necessarily fit neatly within our normal Council parameters and activities. That being said, we have weighed-in on things like marine planning initially through either bringing it places like the CCC where we can get it more on the national stage, or through response letters. So it may be that what we decide to do on the national or International piece would be more of a letter type format, and I would have potentially propose that in September if we get there, and we may not. So, and maybe if you don't mind scrolling down to the national and the international pieces. It would be nice to see them in front of me as I...I'm not going to talk through all of them so bear with me. But I do want to talk for a minute on the market piece because that is specifically not something we typically talk about here, but I do think it's critical for our processing community, and we spend a lot of time in the Council process talking about how to support processors. At both of the organizations that I worked at prior to where I am now I used USDA programs to help support us in terms of export sales, in terms of other program sales. We are talking about budget cuts, others are talking about budget cuts, and I think the ability to say, hey, these are critical for our infrastructure is something that we should strongly consider. And then in terms of international, I just want to talk about a couple of pieces that again, really from my perspective are important, and they're related to leveling the playing field. So we have had the Marine Mammal Protection Act in since 1972. We have something coming up in September in terms of announcement called the List of Foreign Fisheries

and Dr. Lent pointed out that this is basically the implementation of the teeth for that law. It goes into effect January 1st, 2026. By my math that is 53 years that it has taken us to actually potentially level the playing field in terms of having regulations that would meet the same standard that we are requiring of our current fishermen. So I will also say as somebody who works with a lot of importers, knowing as soon as possible, so thank you on September rather than November 30th about what those impacts are is important because while we focus mostly on fisheries and fishermen here, many of our processors rely on imports, as do many of their markets, so that they can get fish to the public in general. That being said, it is critical that all of the fish that they are selling is not doing ecological or human harm to all extent possible. I mean, obviously the fish that we're eating were harmed, but we don't need to be harming others. The other piece that is in Executive Order 13921 related to international that I think is worth noting is regarding port-state measures. This came up earlier this week in our delegation meeting. Hopefully we are supportive of that and hopefully it goes into action. But this is something that was established through the Food and Agricultural Organization to combat IUU fishing. Currently there are 70 parties in the agreement and essentially it would mean that if we had vessels that were IUU fishing we would not be allowing them to come in and get bait or ice or fuel or any other.....sell their fish, and it is a way that collectively we can work together with other member states to again really help level that playing field. So I, you know, is the Council going to do something? Probably not other than to continue to support through international management activities and possibly a letter on these specific topics, but I do think it is worthwhile to raise these issues at the CCC and other venues and continue to raise awareness through this. So with that, hopefully that helps explain why some of these items got expansive on the list for national and international topics and why I will be supporting the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:23] Okay Christa. Rebecca, and then Marci. So Please.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:23:29] Okay thanks. I'll be brief because Christa covered most of it. First of all, I got to give NOAA credit. They did implement the High Seas Driftnet Act and the Tuna-Dolphin Agreement, which is a big part of responding to that, but just the missing piece. On international, just a note, and you rightfully pointed out that what that means is that if we're buying a seafood product, the fisheries these come from are comparable in effectiveness in terms of the target species, not just target species but also bycatch, so that aspect of comparable and effectiveness is not in there, but that's my fault because I didn't pay attention to it. I want to also say the Executive Order says go out and do all these wonderful things. We can't, but we certainly should say here's what we can do. Here's all this other stuff that no matter how hard we try over here, we may never get there because we have all these other problems, like we're radical on water, or we've got imports flowing in. So I think it's important to have that, whether that, you know, procedurally needs to be a motion or something else, that's less important, but that message needs to get sent back. You told us to do these four things, we need more than just what we can do. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:43] Thank you Rebecca. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:24:47] Sorry, did you have someone else in the queue there? But I'm happy to go. Real quick, it's kind of related to that point. So I'm having to support the motion at this point. I recognize this is a broad list. Again, NMFS has been asking for input, you have another Council meeting. I look at this I see a lot of things. I don't know how Council staff, even with some NMFS

support, could really flesh them out further, but if you want to get public comment you're throwing things out there, I think that's fine. And I think we could work with Council staff to help to come back in September and identify, because I do see a mix of things here that are relevant to the EO and the request, but then others that are a little bit outside that might be more relevant for talking with Eugenio when he's here in November about NMFS priorities and decision he can make. It might be more relevant for Merrick to take to the CCC. Or it might be more relevant for this Council to set as one of their priorities, like reviewing it's FMPs, or I forget what the exact....one of the top bullets, right? Because in the end whatever you set forward as your priorities, I think it's helpful to think of the fact that anything that is on that list at your top priorities you will have national support at the NOAA level and potentially elsewhere to help push things through. So what really gets stuck there or could be facilitated there versus you put it on a list and they're saying, great, now you go ahead and do that, right? So I'm not sure that gives you a big win if you get that answer back versus putting something that when you put a measure forward or you take final action and then it goes to NMFS for rulemaking, now we can put that to the top of the list or prioritize it because it was on your Executive Order list. So these are just things to think about. You don't have to answer them now of course. I think for the purpose now, if you want to go broader and then wait til September to help consolidate, I think we could work with Council staff to kind of help flesh out these bins a little bit and make it a little bit more manageable for a way you might end up things falling for your final action in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:58] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:26:58] Thanks Chair. Appreciate the conversation and have some more thoughts on the content, but just wanted to maybe do a little procedural recommendation here. I did hear Sam when he talked earlier in the week about having this be expansive and talking about our ability to comment on things that are actually outside NOAA. I'm not sure if I'm misquoting him there, but that's kind of how I took it, was that it was okay to think about other agencies. Aja, thank you so much for putting this together and taking the lead here. Someone's got to and this is a really great start. I'd maybe throw out for consideration maybe that this second motion isn't necessary as a motion, but is maybe just better as guidance given what Director Burden was saying about sort of the ability to execute on this and sort of the...I've heard Director Burden say before about sort a motion is really very strict guidance for Council staff to follow, so just reflecting on that. And then also wanting to be really inclusive of this because I really appreciate sort of the expansiveness of it and I want that to be part of this. So yeah, just throwing that out for thought and process if that feels right for other people around the table to make sure that we do have a big conversation here and are inclusive at this point.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:21] Thank you Corey. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:28:25] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Maybe just a clarifying question for Miss Szumylo as I'm reflecting on our earlier exchange. You indicated that it was the first motion that really responded to the Executive Order and that this is almost more broad, although I do see that you're logically being motivated by that Executive Order here, looking for maybe some of the same intention behind that Executive Order. But that gets me to thinking about timeline, and so we are being incredibly ambitious here at this agenda item and throughout this entire meeting, and so as I just reflect on what we can actually do I start to have some concerns. And that could be

alleviated if we say this list here isn't necessarily tied to the Executive Order response, and that would maybe give us some more time to reflect on this and bring something back in November? So that's a question for you is whether you do intend this to be part of the Executive Order response or whether we're, whether we could consider this for a little bit longer and think about how to agendize it and it becomes more of a like a strategic planning exercise rather than an Executive Order response. Does that make sense?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:46] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:29:46] Thank you. I think so. I guess drawing on what Ryan just said and what Rebecca and Christa just said as well, we can't miss the opportunity to tell the administration that you can do an Executive Order like this but there's all this other stuff that is tied into it. So I guess my thought here is like if this was a cover letter on top of like, here's your list, here's your table that you asked for, but like please pass along to the administration that there's all this other stuff tied to it and here are ideas that came up, that would cover it for me. I think the importance there for me is the transmission of the ideas in response to the direction to the Council to work on its own, its own regulatory frameworks in response to the Executive Order that like what we can do can only go so far and here's the additional support we need. So I suppose, I guess we could pull back on the assessment of staff workload and impact to industry and more focus on communicating ideas to the administration that are beyond the scope of what we can do that are necessary to us to meet the objectives of the Executive Order. So I don't, yeah, I don't know how to adjust. I don't know how to, where to go from here given those thoughts.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:25] I tell you what, this is a great time to take a break, check out of your room, and let's get back here at 10 o'clock. Does that work for us maybe? What's it?

**Merrick Burden** [00:31:39] 10:10.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:40] 10:10. 10:10. How does that sound?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Okay, thank you everyone for your patience. Did we get checked out of our rooms here in Rohnert Park? Okay, I'll open the floor up and Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:12] Thank you Chair, and thank you everyone for all of the back and forth on this leading up to the agenda item and the discussion on the floor today. I think given what we've discussed here I would like to withdraw the motion. When thinking about the Executive Order it's, again, as I said before, really hard to limit the thinking to just the actions that this Council takes and not connect it to the really broad picture of what the administration can do to support successful fisheries in our region and around the country. So it's really....I think that just demonstrates why this list got so out of hand so quickly is that there's so much more that can be done that isn't in this room. I do, Council staff has heard this discussion and there are several items that are on the list in the second motion that I do think actually do fit into the, they're not planned activities yet, but they could align with some of the things that are in the, that strictly fit into like the template that NOAA fisheries provided for the Councils to fill out. So I invite them to pick from the list that we discussed here today and pull those things into the list in the way that the template asked for later on and bring that part forward with the broader list for public comment at

the September meeting. But regarding the bigger items, I do not want to lose that discussion. And I don't want to lose the opportunity to tell the administration what meaningful support looks like. So I...if it's okay with everyone, I would like to try to put that discussion together of the broader elements that are outside of our purview that would be supportive to U.S. fisheries into something that could be used to form a cover letter and an attachment to what the Council submits and bring that forward to everyone in September for additional public comment and just for, yeah for additional thoughts for how to communicate those really key and critical points to the administration. I'll stop there. So yeah, motion withdrawn.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:42] Okay, thank you Aja. So I'll look around the table and see if everybody's good with that? So Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:02:44] Yeah, as the second I am also willing to withdraw. That being said, I am supportive and more than happy, as I imagine there may be some others to work on something in terms of cover letter or attachment type language with regard to the ones that are not necessarily within the purview of the Council. I spoke to a number of those under the national and international topics. I think that they are critical to the work that we do within this forum and I do think that they highlight, similar to the issues that we talk about regularly in the Council process, all of those components that impact the work we do, whether that's water access for salmon, whether it's hatcheries, whether it's marine planning issues, whether it's international management for tunas and other, maybe not highly migratory, but definitely migratory species like whiting or sardines. We can't do what we need to do if we don't let people know above us what it is going to take to be successful and that would be what that list or potentially cover letter would be. So happy to withdraw my second and very happy to lend support for whatever that document looks like, preferably for the advanced briefing book in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:18] Okay, thank you Christa. So I'll look around and make sure everybody's good at this, okay? Butch.

**Butch Smith** [00:04:25] Yeah some much smarter people said it than I probably will, but I think the discussion spawned through Dr. Lent, and I heard Ryan, and I think I just heard, I did just hear Christa. I'm just sitting right next to her so I did hear her obviously. But the need to not only have, you know, a list of doables that this Council can do, but there are a lot of things that shape our lives in this Council that we can't do and I think at some time, and I think it's important to have both those lists so we're reminded water for salmon is you know the clearest, you know, and there's others, but port infrastructure, if we don't have, that was on that list, and there are some ports that have docks that are 50 and 60 years old that haven't been updated because of money and now sponsoring boats. So the boats aren't getting smaller. There's less few little boats, but more bigger boats. And so those are important things to what we do here in our lives and to the constituents that we serve. So I think it's at some point in time or during this exercise, a do and can't do list might come out of this, and I think that's an important exercise that we could go through also. And that list always changes. You know 25 years ago when energy didn't have any play in this Council, but the last few years it had a very big determination on our lives and what some of us do for a living, and so I just want to point that out. I think this conversation....I think the.....I could have supported or not supported the motion. I agree with the path forward but I think I just would like

to point how important it is to have the main list of topics and then the side list that also affects the lives and stuff of people we serve at this Council. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:50] Thank you Butch. All right. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:06:53] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. And thanks for all the work that's gone into this, Aja and everybody else, and for the brilliance of separating it into two motions. I'll tell Aja later. And thank you, also I sign up to help if that is worthwhile. We should remember too that NOAA, at least for the time being, is in the Department of Commerce. So some of these things might, there might be some folks in commerce who could help us. They've always been supportive of NOAA, right Ryan? Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:24] Thank you Rebecca. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:07:24] Thanks Chair. Thanks Aja for revising this and thinking this through and getting us forward. I just wanted to make sort of a couple overarching notes. I think now is the time to do that. One observation I have is when I read this EO and specifically read sort of the four things we're looking to provide information on was just that the Council does a lot of this already. I think that's been stated and I think that was reflective in Aja's first motion, which is that those four things are something that, while we may not be like intricately related to them, there's like many, many things that are outside of that, those are, I think guiding principles already for the work that this Council does. I also wanted to reflect on the funding reality. I think Dave Kasheta in his public testimony said it really well, we are not getting funding. It's an issue for everybody across the Council universe. you know NMFS in particular, as we think about it in the context of a federal EO, but how NMFS is supposed to support this? How NOAA is supposed to support the work that this Council does seems frankly like an impossibility at this point. So just reflecting on the need for funding to implement this EO and that there is a connection there. Specifically, I wanted to pull out funding for the Pacific Salmon Commission. That has been cut and is critically important to our salmon. How the work that this Council bases off, a lot of folks that are at this Council both as harvesters and as managers participate in that process as well. I am actually not one of them but I see the work that goes into that, recognize that work, and just want to highlight how important funding for that commission is. I have a few thoughts on something I brought up earlier I think when Sam was here. And just noting part of the rationale around this EO, it was at the CCC meeting, which was noting the decrease in production, which seems to be, looking at your notes, dependent 5 to 10%. And as I was thinking about this meeting and preparing for it, I wanted to put that in context of other parts of our American food supply system and what that looks like. And as I was reflecting on that, I think about the really high quality of our fisheries, particularly our West Coast fisheries and what they provide and how that is different in many ways from an agricultural sector that perhaps there has been growth there that we have not seen in our fishery sector but just the difference that that was. So for example, I think about the use of pesticides and fertilizers for a lot of our crops and how that damages the environment. How that, like thinking about the Gulf of Mexico, how that even directly damages fisheries, and our fisheries go out they do not use pesticides, they do not use fertilizers. I think about genetic modification has been a big reason for an increase in crop yield and we do not genetically modify our fish. We have wild species that we go out and we harvest. I also think about the decreases in amount of labor and that connection to that food supply system, which has been lost across a lot of agricultural sectors



in our country and how we don't want to lose that in our fisheries. And just the strong connection that we have, fisheries in our community and the people who fish and fishing culture and how incredibly important that is for so many people across the West Coast. So getting to the point there, which is just to say, I think that a 5% to 10% decrease is not something we want to continue, but I want to recognize that when comparing to other parts of our food supply chain, just how incredibly well a lot of our industry is doing and the value that is in that product and the value that they bring, not only in a monetary sense or a pound sense, but also to their communities and their cultures and the people who are involved with it. In terms of thinking about the guidance that was just offered and the conversation we've had, I was thinking about a few other things just to add to the conversation. It sounds like we're going to have another bite at the apple over this as we lead in September, but just a few things I'd been thinking about was seafood labeling to assist in national marketing of U.S. caught seafood. I think that was probably in Aja's list somewhere, but just putting a finer point on what I continue to think to be something important that any administration could do to support our seafood. Thinking about analogs with the USDA. There are a lot of programs, subsidies, grant programs that are offered in the farming sector that I think could benefit the fishery sector as well. So I think taking a real fine tooth comb, looking at those regulations and thinking about how we could expand them to provide more opportunity for fishermen would be worth doing. I also think it would be worth looking at regulations that guide anti-monopsony and anti-trust policy to be able to increase buyer and processor competition. So having a better functioning market that is hopefully more efficient and encourages growth in the processing and purchasing sector as well as in the harvesting sector so that we have a fairer and more efficient market. And I think I'm going to stop there. Just again, thank you Aja for getting us started here and look forward to continuing the conversation in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:31] Thank you Corey. Really good. Okay. David Sones.

**David Sones** [00:13:37] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I've been thinking about this a lot too and you know one of the things I've really struggled with over the years is these Executive Orders because they come out, we put a bunch of energy into the things and then the next administration comes out, comes along and tosses them all out and we've invested a lot of time and money into how we approach these Executive Orders to the point.....you know it's almost not worth wasting our time, but they do help, hopefully help point out as we're finding here, what kind of things we do need to help our process and our fisheries and beyond the things we deal with, our markets and that type of stuff, so they can be helpful in that manner. But I think, and it would help us I think get back to, you know I don't even know what the schedule is for the Marine Mammal Protection Act or the Magnuson Act for reauthorization, but those are the places where we really need to get our needs and our changes in, because these are acts of Congress and they will stick and stay and not be overturned quickly by another administration. They have to go through Congress to get them done and it just solidifies the decisions and the needs that we have under the act. And with that also, I'm not sure, is somebody tracking to see what actions that we're taking under Executive Orders match up with our rules and our regulations under the Magnuson Act to make sure we're not going outside of those or identifying that these are where we need to make some changes in the act to assist us in managing these resources? So I appreciate all the hard work and everything that goes into these, and I do see the benefit of identifying all this information, but we should think of it in the context of what can we do with Congress to help maybe make these things more permanent to assist us in managing into the future. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:57] Thank you David. Okay, anyone else? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:16:04] Thank you Mr. Chair. I did want to address some content that is in our briefing book that we heard a little about under open comment, but then this proposal from the PWCC was also included among the materials for this agenda item, recognizing that the intended purpose or the intention to quickly develop an EFP certainly fit under the context of what the Executive Order calls for. I just have some concerns with what is there for us in writing and want to take this opportunity to make sure that we take a moment to think about what's contained here and the process that could ensue. I appreciate the intention to submit an application for an EFP to process whiting south of 42 degrees and appreciated the opportunity for some Q&A with the applicants under open comment. That discussion does not or should not constitute a Council review and it's not a substitute for an established Council EFP review and development process that we normally undertake here. This proposal from one of our key stakeholders to go around the Council and go straight to NMFS really should be of concern to us. We have a long history of prioritizing our involvement in developing terms and conditions for EFPs, it's fundamental to our role as a Council and for achievement of the National Standards. Our past efforts to develop EFPs have included things like new technologies such as electronic monitoring as an alternative to onboard observers, trawl gear modifications, various buoy gear and short-set configurations to target swordfish in new ways, and methods to reduce salmon bycatch. Advancements in our fishery management have often emerged from the work conducted in our EFPs across many of our FMPs. They've all followed a Council process that's transparent, where we review the progress, the successes, and the challenges of the EFP being conducted. So to propose to cut our salmon and groundfish stakeholders out of a Council processes and for us as a Council to not have the opportunity to scope, analyze, and develop recommendations on an EFP proposal which targets a key groundfish stock in a high volume fishery operation, that content is fully in our wheelhouse and it doesn't feel right to bypass us. The proposal involves significant bycatch mitigation and there are huge allocation implications, all of which really require detailed discussion and analysis. Groundfish EFPs involve off-the-top set-asides that require consideration in our groundfish specifications process, and the work that is done to determine those set-asides needs to be transparent. Also notably, the proposal isn't a joint proposal from the mothership and catcher processor fleets, yet those fleets together desire to continue to be managed as one at-sea unit for purposes of our catch accounting and our trawl IQ program. The Council's been made aware that multiple of these at-sea set-asides have been exceeded in recent years. In 2022, sablefish, arrowtooth, sorry, shortspine, and other flatfish were exceeded. In 2023, sablefish, shortspine, and darkblotched were exceeded. And in 2024, sablefish and shortspine were exceeded. And as we heard back in March, many commenters reminded us that those overages have potential to put other groundfish sectors at risk. So if I understood the applicants correctly on Friday, their proposal would only include a cap on salmon and not caps on other groundfish species. That would just be tremendously unfair and unfortunate were that to come to fruition outside of a Council process. We are the entity that has the expertise to build terms and conditions and develop recommendations on caps for groundfish for an EFP rather than set-asides, and we need to rely on the expertise of our GMT and with input from the GAP on essentially what would be de facto allocations. Thinking about the geography that's proposed for this EFP activity, very sensitive area off northern California right off the mouth of the Klamath River, and with the status of Klamath salmon and dam recovery, dam removal recovery in the first year, it's not a great time to be experimenting with large volume gear that could pose substantial risk of high volume salmon bycatch. It's an incredibly

sensitive geographic area. Meanwhile, our commercial salmon fleet has been closed in this area now for three years and the sport fishery in the California KMZ has had no fishing to only a few days to maybe a maximum of six weeks over the last six seasons or so, and that's because of the weak Klamath salmon stocks, listed coastal Chinook and coho concerns. So if we're going to increase opportunities in this geographic area, it shouldn't come with risks to rebuilding salmon stocks. Moving to the topic of utilization. Most of our groundfish stocks experience utilization of lower than 50% of available yields. We saw that in our spex flex agenda item and in the analytical document under E.7, we discussed that yesterday. But notably, whiting attainment in the catcher-processor sector is actually very high, and that was reflected on page 30 of the Intersector Allocation Review analytical document in Agenda Item E.5, Attachment 1. That table shows that between 2011 and 2024 there were only three years with less than 75% attainment of the CP sector's allocation after tribal reapportionment. And since 2016 attainment has averaged 84.5 percent, that's pretty high. Meanwhile, it's only been a small handful of our other groundfish stocks that have reached attainment levels of 75 percent or better. So importantly, the actions that the Council develops in response to the Executive Order, that we've indicated they need to stabilize markets, improve access, enhance economic profitability, and prevent closures. But given that the CP sector already highly utilizes their sector allocation, this particular EFP proposal, which is aimed to improve access to an already highly utilized whiting resource, would be less effective in achieving the objectives of the Executive Order than other proposals. It also shouldn't be forgotten that important progress was made recently in addressing concerns with whiting utilization. We changed the start date to begin May 1, which was two weeks earlier than previously. That was a process that we undertook, and in that process leadership from the whiting industry, which is a fishery sector that's well represented in our process, proposed that action and the Council prioritized it. Review and comment took place and we recommended to NMFS that it happen, and that's how our process works and should work. The Council's previously expressed a willingness to consider an EFP for whiting processing south of the Oregon-California border, where our process would allow for careful development of terms and conditions to safeguard against high bycatch events, not just for salmon, but for other listed and highly attained stocks. We have an established process for considering groundfish EFPs, and I am absolutely supportive of considering and working through our process to develop a proposal to better access whiting off California that is carefully tailored through our deliberative process. This is not a proposal where expediency should drive decision-making on terms and conditions, and this Council needs to send that message to NMFS in response. So with that I do have a motion to offer, if I may?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:59] Marci. Sure.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:25:59] Thank you. I move the Council recommend to NMFS that it not prioritize review, development, or issuance of an Exempted Fishing Permit outside of the Council process to the Pacific Whiting Conservation Cooperative to process whiting south of 42 degrees north latitude in response Executive Order 14276, Restoring American Seafood Competitiveness. Prospective applicants should continue to use established on-ramps for Council consideration of new groundfish EFPs via either the groundfish workload and management measure prioritization process, the preliminary EFP agenda item shown on the proposed November 2025 agenda under Agenda Item C.6, Supplemental Attachments 4 and 6, or open public comment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:01] Marci is the language on the screen accurate?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:27:02] Yes it is, thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:03] Thank you. Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Thank you Marc. Speak to your motion as you need to. I think you're probably there but.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:27:11] I think I did. Thank You.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:15] Okay, open up questions for the motion maker? Okay, discussion on the motion before us? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:27:26] I think that Miss Yaremko covered it pretty well, but I just want to emphasize that the current restrictions on processing south of 42 were adopted through a very careful open public process with due consideration for the risks that that activity would present, and to avoid that process in an effort to restore some processing south of 42 I think is disrespectful to the Council process. This year, given the state of Klamath stocks, the California salmon fishery is limited to impacts of less than 100 Klamath fish, and I think that if there were, we were to have a discussion on an EFP, you know a parameter like that would be taken into consideration. So I'm going to support the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:28:39] Thank you Marc. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:28:40] Thank you Chair. I know I'm often the GMT historian or an historian from a variety of things. Has the Council ever made a motion such as this, providing NMFS guidance like this? I know in the past there have been some out of cycle EFPs. I'm just trying to understand some process if anything like this has been forwarded before? Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:16] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:29:19] Thank you Mr. Chair. I do know that NMFS has, in at least one instance, issued an EFP without Council review. But I can't speak to whether or not the Council has ever before directed NMFS to do it, not to do it, that's a NMFS thing. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:49] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:29:49] Yeah if I may, I don't have the answer necessarily, but maybe some additional clarification, right? I mean I think I've been looking a lot at the EFP ranks at this meeting. I think they clearly discuss when you have an application bringing it out for Council review. So I think Council input as it relates to an EFP or as it relates to what NMFS should consider as it's reviewing an EFP, I think that could come in various forms. My concern here is I don't see the tie to the Council tasks under this agenda item, and I'm a little wary about how this connects to actions directly to meet the Executive Order goals or the specific things that we have noticed under the agenda item here that we would be discussing and potentially putting forward here. So that's where I struggle with the relevance of this. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:41] Okay. Thank you Ryan. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:00:00] I think that's a fair point, but I think when something happens outside of the Council process that we need a little flexibility within our Council agenda to address it if the Council chooses to address it. I think EFPs outside of the Council process there's been some, this would be the first time that that has been criticized by the Council. And I think that it is fair to find a place for the Council to express itself on out-of-cycle EFPs, especially one of this nature, which is significant.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:39] Thank you Marc. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:00:45] Yes, thank you. If I may just reply to Ryan's remarks. I am bringing this motion because I think this may be our only chance. If I'm reading the language in the letter, it is very clear that the intention is to go to NMFS with this proposal, and it uses the basis as the EO. And so I don't know how it isn't appropriate to consider under this agenda item when the materials were supplied by the proponents under this agenda item and with the intention of fulfilling the objectives of the EO. So I would hope that the proponents would come back and use the on-ramps that we have for considering EFPs, but that wasn't what was conveyed in the letter. It was expressed that there was an intention to go straight to the National Marine Fisheries Service for review and issuance. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:02] Thank you Marci. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:02:02] Thank you. I'll respond to a few things. I'll note that the commenters did, you asked this question on the record during open public comment Marci, you asked why are you coming here today and why bring this to us? The point was engagement. They did bring it before the Council and mentioned specifically in responding to the comments that they wanted to be fully transparent and had no interest in moving the ask forward in front of other priorities. I think practically my understanding of what would happen on the agency side of things, and this is why I've been harping all week on aligning the agency process with what the Council does for its process on EFPs, is that the agency still has to publish a Federal Register Notice to call for comments. There's no reason why that ask or that Federal Register Notice couldn't overlap with the November 2025 Council meeting. The letter does state that they were trying to give advance notice and advanced chance for the agency to work back and forth on this item. So the idea was expediency and asked to have the permit, if possible, issued before 2027, which is what alignment with the full Council process would have provided, just acknowledging all the challenges that industry is facing over time. The applicants also noted, or the applicants are still in the process of coordinating with the mothership sector as well. And so the, you know, the statements about not coordinating are not there. The application hasn't been submitted yet and isn't written in stone yet so. Also with EFP processes, I want to make clear from my experience working in the agency for a very long time, this Council adds a really burdensome additional layer of processing and review for EFPs beyond what is specified in the regulation. I understand that that coordination is there in some cases to deal with allocative questions that Miss Yaremko raised in her discussion before the motion, but the applicants did look into this and noted that those concerns weren't necessarily there in this case. I think some of the, some of the EFP process review work that's happening on a broader scale and that came up through the Council process improvements discussion was that there are some EFPs that may fall outside of this need for aligning with allocations, and they may warrant for expediency direct submission to NOAA. I take, from my experience inside of the

agency, you know I'd like to ask for comments on the agency's ability to develop terms and conditions on its own without help from the Council process. I think that that's possible. I've seen that happen all the time. I understand that there is a benefit through that coordination. And again, the Council, the regulations that are in place do discuss that it's a really reasonable thing to try to overlap the public comment period with the Council so that input could happen, and that could absolutely still happen in this case. But I don't want the public to think like that the EFP process cannot happen out of the watchful eye of the Council because that's not true. And it, in fact, goes to some degree against the intent of this Executive Order, which is to move forward opportunities to explore, explore additional fishing opportunities for the fleet. And again, there would be no.....by not going through the Council process that doesn't mean that the opportunity for public comment or for Council comment on this is precluded, and that's the case for any EFP that happens. So yeah, I just want to hear from the agency what it's like to develop terms and conditions outside of this process, or if that's even possible.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:19] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:06:19] The terms and conditions for the EFP in particular? Yeah, I mean, typically when we put the EFP application out for public review comments like that could come in. The Council has frequently weighed-in in multiple FMP formats of guidance in addition to their thoughts on the EFP itself, but also proposed terms and conditions NMFS could review, we take that into account, but ultimately the process in the regs is quite clear that we develop the terms and conditions on our own as we are going through, after the public comment process has entered before we issue the application.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:00] Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:07:00] Thank you. This is a question for Ryan. I'm curious, just thinking about if we're, I'm thinking about how the EFP process normally works and that we go through and I hear often from NMFS that, you know, there's workload associated with EFP and what does this look like? Are there staff ready, at the ready to work on this EFP? And the second part of my question is, what does this look like in the new way of looking at EFPs that don't have to come to the Council if other EFPs are coming? Now, this opens the door to other EFPs coming throughout this normal process through the Council and what does that look like for workload at NMFS?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:03] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:08:03] Yeah, through the Chair. Thanks Miss Hall for the question. On your.....excuse me just a second. On your second point, maybe I'll start with your first point, right? Yes, there's definitely workload questions associate with this, right? I mean we have reduced staff. A lot of the people that you would want to work on other actions you've identified as priorities and that even these EFP applicants themselves have said they didn't want this to supersede will be working on those, and so I do have limited folks to pull from. That said, there are the potential, some resources if these are broader EFPs, I mean broader priorities of this administration, et cetera, but workload will be an issue let me be clear here. I don't have a clear path. November is pretty soon and we haven't quite figured that out yet. And there's workload, I think, to your second question, there's workflow concerns regardless. You know in the typical EFP process, and we just

discussed this under the HMS agenda item on what was recommended and that the Council also then endorsed, is that applicants go to NMFS before they go to the Council before any kind of Council review, because that allows us to have some kind of feedback and back and forth to get an application to where it's ready to actually get constructive input, whether it's by the Council or the public. And there's workload associated with that too, right? So there's workload on both ends. And since I have the floor, if you don't mind, I do want to note that I think that the discussion here is helpful, right? And for the purposes of wherever you want to go with this motion, I think the discussion seems sufficient to convey the concerns to NMFS that we've heard around the table without a motion. That would get around my concerns around the lack of notice issue, even though there is some connection to the EO as described by Miss Yaremko and in the language, and Miss Lynch is online if there's any questions on that point. With that said, because of that kind of dichotomy, I would abstain from any vote on this motion but happy to take any further questions on the EFP process itself or on how NMFS then would take this going forward depending on what Council action is. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:20] Thank you Ryan. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:10:23] Thank you Chair. I share the concerns on this. There's an issue of process and an issue of substance. On the substance, when I first heard about that all I could think about was zero commercial catch of salmon the last 3 years in California. That's tough, but setting that aside, going through the process, even if the process had started earlier and gone through the Council first, that salmon issue wouldn't go away. There was an attempt, and I'd like to hear from GAP folks if they're willing to talk about it, but there was an effort made to come early to this meeting to attend the GAP to talk about it with proponents and it was presented to the GAP. There was the Q&A after that. At least that day that I was at the GAP I don't think there was a lengthy discussion or any conclusion reached. I don't think there's anything in the report. But Mr. Chair I don't know if we could ask our few remaining but very brilliant GAP members here if they could weigh-in on that. I also note that EFPs are still part of the special projects so we'll have another chance to look at that. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:32] Okay, well we do have a GAP member here so, our token GAP member left. Merit. And Rebecca you want to...did you hear the question?

**Merit McCrea** [00:11:46] And so I wandered in to listen in on this so here I am.....(laughter).... Chair Pettinger, Council, the GAP did not discuss this extensively. I sensed that there was tension in the GAP potentially and that nobody wanted to even touch it.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:13] Okay. Thank you Merit. Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:12:20] Yeah, thank you. I have to say I'm right there with the GAP. I'm a little hesitant to weigh-in since this is not necessarily my area of expertise, but on the HMS side with the FIW I do feel like there might be a couple of pieces here, and I spoke to that even earlier in this conversation around D.2 of it may be beneficial to look at how do we streamline the process collectively. That does not solve the issue of this particular EFP. I have a question I think for NMFS in terms of based upon this discussion whether one of the terms and conditions could be that they bring it back to the Council for review? We certainly under HMS had a number of terms

of conditions that were not initially included in things like the Midwater Snap-Gear EFP that they didn't have to come back to the Council, but they were not necessarily things that were in any form of EFP we had seen. So it was a....I'm just wondering if the opportunity is there based upon this discussion and the concerns. I also am appreciative of the fact that this is not a stop work. This isn't don't take it. This is a don't prioritize. I do have some concerns in general around EFPs and how long it's taking, whether that is the midwater rockfish, whether it's....I mean we did just get the EFPs for a couple of our HMS fisheries, but those took many, many, many years, and I just am concerned about how the whole process works as a whole, and so I do think that overall the conversation needs to be there. And while I am appreciative of the maker of the motion's concerns around salmon, I guess I would ask the general question, and again, this is a little bit out of my realm, but there are quite a number of species that are prosecuted that we hear about consistently in the whiting fishery that have been areas of concern, and we saw some of that in the conversation, if it was March or April, between mothership and CPs, and I just want to make sure that as this process goes through that we are not inadvertently causing harm to any of our stakeholders, not whiting specific, but I realize the focus is on salmon based upon 3 years of having no season for our commercial folks and very, very limited for our recreational folks. But we certainly have had a number of other topics that are brought up and concerned about constraints on those for others as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:35] Thank you Christa. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:15:36] Thank you Mr. Chair. If I may just respond a bit to that. Yes there are salmon concerns, but there are equal concerns with regard to the at-sea set-asides and the situation that we have right now with repeated exceedances in the at-sea sector as a whole for important species that we are managing across a number of groundfish fishery sectors. There are huge allocative implications to setting off the top set-asides in EFPs, especially given the species involved where there are bycatch concerns, shortspine, thornyhead, sablefish, darkblotched, flatfish, have all been recently exceeded and we need to be very careful about how we determine appropriate off-the-top set-asides or caps in a case of an EFP. What I heard from the applicant when asked about groundfish caps was that there wasn't intention to have any. That should be of concern to us and certainly concern to members of our GAP and our stakeholders because we have major allocation decisions to make in the upcoming spex cycle on species like shortspine thornyhead, which are needed across all of our sectors, and the only way to deliberate a sharing arrangement with all the needs across fisheries is through a Council process. And in fact we have established COPs to consider EFPs. We have preliminary consideration of EFPs for the 27-28 biennium scheduled on our November Year-At-a-Glance and our November Draft Agenda. We take those preliminary applications at our November meeting and we review them and determine if there's merit and if there's an ability to develop things like the set-asides and terms and conditions in time for final adoption of EFP on the cycle, usually that's June. And so that EFP development process occurs concurrently with the development of the specifications. So again, there are months that allow for GAP review and for public input on development of terms and conditions for our groundfish EFPs that are established in, I believe it's COP 19. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:53] Okay Marci. Aja.



**Aja Szumylo** [00:18:53] Thank you. Two things I want to note in response to that Marci. The applicants did not ask for an increase in set-asides or an increase for bycatch allowances above and beyond what's already authorized in the regulation. So this isn't like an EFP where we're asking, or other EFPs where they're asking for additional catch to prosecute the fishery. It's operating exactly as the fisheries does in other regions but just extending that operation to another place. So any bycatch that happened under the EFP would come off of their existing set-asides. There have been broader discussions about the ACL, or the set-aside overages. I'll note overall that in spite of there being set-aside overages, they did not ultimately contribute to ACL overages. And so I just want to be clear about where those things fit into the broader picture of things. And the applicants also noted that the intent of this EFP is to ultimately reduce bycatch. They gave lengthy testimony that having additional area to move could provide additional opportunity to reduce bycatch overall. And one of the things that they hope to test with the EFP is whether or not having additional room to fish could allow them to avoid high bycatch events in areas where they're currently only allowed to fish, in the limited area that they currently allow to fish. So I just want to be clear again that while the Council.....the traditional review process that's set up where each individual EFP is reviewed through the advisory body process potentially could be precluded in this case. Honestly, what I'm thinking about with the timeline is that it might, you know, honestly with workload considerations, everything, there's a really good chance that this just comes up through November anyways. Even if it was submitted to the agency early, they may not have a chance to publish a Federal Register Notice until it overlapped with an existing Council meeting anyways. I don't really see that the opportunities that you are talking about for additional Council review will be precluded by early coordination with the agency at this point. So I just want to be clear that the attempt seemed to be to reach out early, to get early communication going, to signal a need that may not align with the overall process in terms of timing of issuance, but, you know, could align with the other opportunities for input that you're looking for. And, you know, the applicants were also really.....all the issues about bycatch species in salmon that were raised today, the applications were really clear that those are of high concern and priority to them too. So there was not the supposition that input from the other affected fleets would not come into the thinking of this. I want to note with EFPs as well that, you know, an application, yeah it's a chance to bring a thought forward and have it vetted, and until now this application has never gone to the agency so you know I know that there was past discussion that, you know, there's several instances. There was one case in 2025 when the applicants previously raised this before. They applied at the same time as United Catcher boats, and the Council advised them not to apply at that point either until there was more work done on the salmon biological opinion, which is in place now. But it also came up in the context of the whiting utilization action, and the Council at that point also advised exploration of an EFP as well. And so the thinking, the long thinking on this has been there. The way that this came up was not intended to preclude from additional thinking to make sure that impacts are reduced.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:54] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:22:54] Yeah, thanks. Just trying to do a little more thinking on this and what might play out, right? I mean, I appreciate the comments by Miss Yaremko, right? We have a November and June process the Council has set up that's married to spex, you know, for good reason, right? It's connected to the set-aside and all that's correct, right? So I think NMFS still has a lot of discussion with the applicants. We don't have an application yet that are planned. I think

we would strongly encourage them, assuming they would want to fish this just beyond 2026, that that would be part of this process looking forward because it would need to tie to the next 27-28 spex process and we have a process for that. But Aja is also correct, right? If you're talking about 2026, just that fishing year, this would be tied, my understanding from their presentation to already issued, you know harvesting their already issued quota and staying within their currently incidental set-aside. So with that said, you know we would probably then have to come back to that November discussion and see if we were going to, if NMFS was ready to move forward with an application thinking it was warranted for 2026, then we'd have to find out another way to try and overlap public comment period at a future Council meeting I think as Aja mentioned and say, for example, March. But again, this is all pretty decisional. We still haven't seen the application. I have workload issues to try and figure out who could even work on this. There's a number of questions that I raised to the applicants of wanting to have further discussions with them and with our Science Centers regarding the genetic sampling. So there's still a lot of variables here but at least that's kind of how I see things that how they could play out. But I do think it is important to note that those are kind of two different things. We issue EFPs in the groundfish world per the regs annually with the ability to renew, and to get at Miss Svensson's question, that time for kind of terms and condition discussion is usually when we go into the Council for public comment, but of course if we did that for one year and then you're looking at a renewal of an application and you decide later now with the next one you want different, you want to make recommendations that terms and conditions can be altered, that can always be done. The terms and conditions we issue in the initial permit can then be modified when we renew applications on an annual basis. I mean, that process is iterative as it should be, right? You're testing out in a lot of things and you learn things. We've done that with all of our EFPs to some extent you know, not necessarily major tweaks. So hopefully that at least sets out a little bit of the parallel world between Council Action and NMFS work under the EFP regulations.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:48] Okay, thank you Ryan. Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:25:48] Thank you. And I was thinking about some of the information that you just shared Ryan of with.....well first I want to start by appreciating that the applicants have offered to do a lot of the work, you know, but then also thinking about the process being outside of the normal EFP process, what does that look like? How does that actually work without the intent that was described to not affect other priorities? And so the idea that it would be published in the Federal Register Notice that overlapped with the Council meeting, my comment is getting to this, is then how do we notify our advisory bodies and others that that would be a comment? Is this something we would need to talk about under workload planning? Find a space for it that's not already there, which is kind of a priority. I did hear you say maybe under the NMFS Report, but again, how do we notify our GMT and our GAP and the public that there's an expectation that they would comment on this Federal Register Notice? So again I'm just thinking about the details. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:09] Thank you Heather. Okay, Ryan.

**Heather Hall** [00:27:14] Yes, thank you.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:27:17] Yeah, through the Chair, and thanks Miss Hall for the question. This is a little bit off the top of my head, right? And we can talk about this more in workload planning as need be, right? I mean there's a few areas where you could give guidance, right? We do have two Council agenda items in November where this may come up. You have EFPs preliminary already on your agenda. You have NMFS priorities where you'll have our Assistant Administrator as well as our Regional Administrators here talking about too, which could be another area the Council gives input. So perhaps we can explore this further in workload planning and I can think about it a little, but I think there may be a few places you could do that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:53] Thank you Ryan. Okay, Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:27:53] Thanks Chair. A couple thoughts here. I'm hearing a discussion about sort of the value of the Council process that we have around EFPs and matching that with the reality that legally applicants can go directly to NMFS right now. And I think in hearing a little bit of what Mr. Wulff was saying, you know that I think it's a Council assumption or just a personal assumption that the agency always does the best they can in everything they do. That includes things like terms and conditions for EFPs and literally everything they do that we ask them to do and they do on their own, and I think sometimes the Council can get a little bit big in its britches. You know ultimately everything we do here at this Council is just advisory to the National Marine Fisheries Service. So what is the value of the Council and the process as we currently have it? And that is bringing in things like, in this case it would be GMT analysis, we would have GAP input. You know it sounds like it was maybe a start of a conversation but not a full one, and it sounds like it was probably a fragile one that could have used a little bit more support, but wanting to have that difficult conversation be able to happen in the GAP. And the salmon groups, those folks having an opportunity to be able weigh-in as well. A really important part to me is dialogue between people, and that is important for things like conservation groups as well as industry folks who are smaller and may not have as much representation or ability to participate in this Council or with NMFS directly, and when you have a federal register process, you know that is largely a one-way street. You know you submit something on email and that is what it is. The Council also, as it does in everything that it does, it builds the record for NMFS. It increases transparency, it brings in the expertise, and it even takes in some of the workload. And I heard Mr. Wulff speak briefly to that and I won't try to paraphrase that. I think, and I'm hearing this from Aja generally, I'm hearing it around the table, I've heard it several times from Christa and the Council is working on it, which is can we improve our EFP process? And I think the answer is yes. The FIW's working on this. This was something that came up under the, shoot I can't remember what we're calling them now, special projects, thank you Rebecca. The special projects. So I'm hoping within a couple years, or it's my expectation and hope that in a couple of years the FIW has completed its work and we're able to rethink all of our EFP processes for all of our FMPs. For this one in particular I'm hearing that while there is a very good chance that some of this work may come back to the Council for some of the processes I just mentioned, it sounds like that's not for sure, that it would depend a little bit on when NMFS got to this, when the public comment period would be open, and it would depending on the Council agenda. So just noting some trepidation there that it might slash probably but not for sure come back. And I just wanted to note that I'm in hearing Aja talk about this and thanking again the authors of this for coming to the Council meeting earlier this week, I really appreciated that and am impressed by sort of the depth of what they provided, which is that I don't see this as an intent to sort of get around limits as they've been said. I didn't read it that way. And

so for me fundamentally it's about is there a real need to be fishing in this geographic area at this time and how the benefits in fishing in this area are distributed? The area right now is just deeply sensitive and thinking about like the Klamath and the dams coming down and also all the very real and difficult situation that commercial and recreational fishing on the north coast has been facing, it's been extremely real and this Council is working in different ways to try to relieve some of that, but for me this just feels like the wrong time. There's just such a small margin of error and even if there are clear limits and the sector is keeping within those limits, there's still risk. So I'm just going to stop there. Marci, thank you for this. I plan to support it. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:26] Okay, thank you Corey. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:00] Thank you Chair. Not to keep belaboring this, but I'm really torn here. We have, there have been at least one EFP that I can remember that went straight through NMFS, but we also have a process set up to review EFPs so we get the holistic look. The whiting industry is very important to Oregon. The salmon industry is very important to Oregon. So I feel like sort of being....trying to choose the favorite child on this motion. I was....the applicants did reach out to me. We happened to be at an event together a week or so ago, and after that I did reach to our salmon folks because as you all know I don't sit in the seat for salmon for ODFW. They didn't have a whole lot of time to get back to me, but they did have some concerns about the potential for bycatch because that area does really impact especially southern Oregon. And because of the process concerns and not being able to fully think about the salmon implications compared to the groundfish implications, I'm probably going to abstain from this particular motion, which I know has its own implications. I'm just unsure on the process and I don't have enough information from our salmon folks to really say yay or nay at this point so. I do appreciate the robust discussion we've been having and all the reasons why we're having them, but I just figured I should let you all know what I'm thinking about and why I'm torn and yeah, I think that's it. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:52] Great. Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:01:52] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you Lynn for your remarks. I appreciate the torn nature and I guess that's why maybe I would like to just take a bit to explain the recommendation to not prioritize this particular EFP development and review outside of the Council process. We've heard a lot about the need for stability, the need for utilization of our sustainable groundfish stocks. The EO is aiming to stabilize markets and improve access and enhance profitability and prevent closures, but in terms of priority, given that the CP sector is so highly attained already at nearly 85% since 2016, that's pretty good utilization of the CP's sector allocation. And so, not to say that there aren't still needs there, but in terms of trying to maximize profit and prevent closures that their allocation is already highly attained. And so perhaps thinking about EFPs and thinking about the Executive Order and the objectives of the EO, this particular activity among all of the other priorities and things that we're wanting to do to achieve the Executive Order, I would just, I guess, assert that this might not be among our highest priorities in light of the attainment that's already occurring in this sector. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:13] Director Burden. Oh, Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:04:18] I'll try to be quick because we've been, we've spent way too much time on this meeting overall. But I want to, I do want to say that I don't think that the GAP discussion on this was appropriately characterized. And so I do you want to clarify the record there. I think that there was a quick discussion of it but I don't know that they're....they they did not, it was a comment that was largely submitted under open public comment so I don't think that they got the chance to bring forward what they were thinking in their discussion. They did spend time on it and that, the description that Merit offered I appreciate him offering it on short notice and not when he was expecting to, but it wasn't the way that that discussion went. I'm concerned about the wording issuance in this. I don't know, you said aloud review and development. Again, I want to say that the applicants did mention that they were not asking for prioritization above and beyond all the things that are already happening and so, and I hear that that's what this motion says is not prioritizing review or development, but I'm not clear what you mean on issuance. So I want, I would love some clarity in what you mean by issuance there. And then I just, I want to say more broadly, optically a motion under an Executive Order agenda item, speaking against issuance of an EFP may not be the best look, but I'll leave that there for you guys to think about in whatever way you'd like to. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:47] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:05:47] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I've been really not wanting to weigh-in on this discussion, but since we've been here I have received a couple of complaints from the public about not being able to comment on this, and that raises, I think, the question of notice that Ryan was mentioning a bit ago. So I would ask if NOAA General Counsel, I think Sheila is online. I hope NOAA General Counsel can weigh-in and maybe provide some clarity for us about the notice issues that we seem to be facing and asking ourselves at the moment.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:31] Sheila.

**Sheila Lynch** [00:06:31] Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:32] We can.

**Sheila Lynch** [00:06:34] Great. Okay, thanks. Getting used to this new system. Yeah, I think this one is a bit of a close call notice-wise. I mean there, there is sort of a tie-in to the Executive Order agenda item, but it does seem like this one tips over into the counseling and substantively on the merits of the EFP proposal and so you know I think there are concerns here that are justified. And you know the agenda item does refer to the Council providing guidance in terms of prioritizing, so it seems like an option here would be to provide guidance without the formal motion and that that would resolve some of the notice concerns as Ryan mentioned previously.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:36] Okay, thank you. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:40] Thank you Mr. Chair. I had some comments but they're related to this moving forward as a motion. If it becomes guidance that's moot. So maybe I'll just step back for a minute and see how we proceed here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:05] Okay. Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:08:05] Thank you Mr. Chair, and with trepidation stepping back into this. I think it's really difficult here, as it probably would be for any EFP to separate the normal process from the merits, whether or not this would be something that the Council would like along with all its stakeholders once it's formally in the pipeline. But I believe I heard Mr. Wulff say something about having a Council record of discussion or guidance rather than recommending to NMFS about priorities, so it might be good to get more clarity on that, what would work best. And I'm not sure I followed the legal guidance we just got. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:54] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:08:54] Yeah, through the Chair, thanks Dr. Lent for the question. Yeah, it's consistent with what General Counsel said because of the potential notice concerns. I think this discussion has been, and with the language on the screen, has been very clear that we can take this back as part of, as guidance to think about as we're looking at this. We don't have an application yet. We would definitely take this full discussion as well as the language here if it was considered guidance. So I think that was the intent of my comment as well as General Counsel's was I think the intent of this would get across and probably be more appropriately characterized with the notice of actions here before the Council under this agenda item. I hope that's helpful.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:43] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:09:43] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to just expand a bit on this current dialogue. And it does relate to something I said earlier in this meeting. Guidance is helpful when there's consensus around the Council table. And so absent the consensus I usually ask for a motion and so now we have a process issue. I think what I heard from General Counsel is perhaps we are in a violation here. So I think maybe this is wordsmithing a bit, but I don't hear guidance because I don't hear consensus. I hear concerns of some Council members. And so I wouldn't convey this as a consensus guidance from the Council if we stop here. I would make sure that NMFS treats this as concerns from some Council members. So I think it's important just to say that, make clear that that is what happens if we stop here, is that NMFS has heard some concerns but it's not a unanimous thing around the table. So don't know if that matters to you all but I did want to make that clear.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:52] Thank you Merrick. Heather, and then Christa.

**Heather Hall** [00:10:56] Thank you. I just want to say we also don't have a proposal. There's no EFP application at this point. Under open public comment we, I think that was done in a way of like helpful to the Council. We're thinking about this. We're planning to submit it to NMFS. Going to the GAP was helpful to get the idea out there, but we don't....there is no applicant, application at this time for EFP. Maybe if there's one submitted to NMFS over the summer and the NMFS Report in September gives us the confirmation that something's been submitted, maybe that's where we talk about what does the process look like. I'm just throwing that out there.

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

**Christa Svensson** [00:11:52] Yeah, thank you. Firstly, because we have not withdrawn the motion, I will say that if this becomes a motion I will be voting not in support of, so no on the motion and it's for a couple of reasons. One, I think EFPs, as I've spoke about I don't even know how many times this morning, are critical to our process. But secondly, we did not notice this, which we've now had guidance from General Counsel. I have been over here frantically emailing and texting people from industry saying, hey guys, can you please get on? Or what do you think? It certainly has not provided time to meaningfully consult with people. I would be much more comfortable with this as guidance. I am concerned about what our Executive Director just said in terms of generalized guidance. And that's simply because the previous motion that we had up on this agenda item we withdrew as guidance and now I'm questioning, well, is that some of us not all of us, et cetera? So I think for clarity purposes if we're going to do guidance then we do guidance. And I think it is fair to characterize going back to this conversation kind of how the chips have fallen moving forward. So just putting a caveat there in that one. And I will just reflect for a minute on the whole conversation around hey, this would be applicable for this year and we've already essentially got it covered with our allocations. You know that, I think it was the March meeting, it really stood out in terms of concern around allocation within the whiting sector. Again, have not consulted with anybody within the whiting sector, but even if the allocation is already out there, what is the impact to people with this EFP? So hopefully, because November is right around the corner, we can bring this forward, have the Council weigh-in and alleviate a lot of people's concerns and also have the opportunity to consult with people. The one other thing I will just highlight, I think some of the consternation that we are hearing is slightly unfair to the CPs. They have been transparent in the process. They at least did us the courtesy of coming in and saying we're planning on doing this, and it is something that I would hope we would want to encourage because people do have the ability to go get the EFPs outside of our process and I do worry that in having this type of motion or this type of conversation that, excuse me, we are going to discourage people from being transparent with us in the future rather than really engaging in the whole process. And just again pointing to the FIW I think anything we can do to streamline so that we don't have this disconnect between the Council process and the NMFS process would be important. So, thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:44] Okay, thanks Christa. Butch.

**Butch Smith** [00:15:44] My grandmother would say this is a wing dinger, and that is for sure, and you know it's surprising how many people have your cell phone number....(laughter)....in this process that you didn't know about and I'm surprised it's not smoking and on fire, but that's besides the point. I look at this, you know, we promote and support and try to find a way to open access to our fishermen, but we also have got to be aware that it doesn't put the other fishermen out of business to do that. I think when those three gentlemen, I think it was three, sat at the table, I think when they said, or what I heard they say, we don't have to come here, I don't think they, I think that was taken out of context by few, by some, not few, by some. What I heard was, hey we're here we want to be open and let you know what we're trying to do here. I do hope they went home and maybe are thinking their game plan on this issue in knowing the importance on being inclusive maybe before they drop this EFP. Like Miss Ridings said, the register method is a very sterile and unhuman type of process where this process, the exchange of ideas, the concerns, the staff that we have to answer those concerns, to me would be an advantage for a person that was trying to do this so they could react and maybe shape their fisheries accordingly. So I am not for one to get the

Council sued and so, you know, I get this motion and I could support it if it fit in what it's supposed to fit in and people were able to comment and whatever. But if by the motion being out of place, I mean I have to think that, but I just want to make sure that this is a volatile issue. You know like I said, when I first, my comments back to him, timing is everything. And I just want to make sure this, whatever happens, this process is vetted and the proper people are able to comment in a public forum. And that doesn't mean that I think that the gentleman that were before us were trying to do anything but that. But the perception of going around the Council process scares a lot of people, and I will say that. And that's not a thumbs up or a thumbs down for this. You know I would like to see what the scientists and the people who know much more than me could figure what would be caught, but I think my colleague Marc stated that there's not much wiggle room right now for anything to be taken in the salmon world and there's caps on the other fish that are, seem to be at the levels right at the, right at tippy top of those. So anyway those are my thoughts and no way am I throwing cold water on somebody wanting to look at new avenue's as a way to take healthy stocks of fish out of water, but I do have those concerns and what we're doing here. And I would have these concerns if it was off the coast of Washington. I, you know support fishermen and communities but also the conservation needs of this process and I'd like to see those be carried out to the fullest extent. Thank you Mr. Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:08] Thank you Butch. Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:20:09] Yeah, thanks. I wanted to get to what Executive Director Burden said because I have a slight disagreement. I actually do think we have some consensus guidance here, at least to NMFS. I think NMFS has clearly heard that consistent with its regulations, well I'll just say NMFS has clearly from this Council that should it want to move forward with this application and deem it warranted, that it come back to the Council to allow for the Council's ability to weigh-in that in a public process manner that gives us their input, not just on whether NMFS should or should not issue it, but where we should prioritize it or any potential terms and conditions or suggestions that might come from the Council. I've not heard a single person, including the applicants, suggest that NMFS shouldn't at some point, once it has an application, whether it's when the Federal Notice is out and the public comment is out or whether it's through your processes, that it would not come back to the Council or that it shouldn't come back to the Council. So I've heard clear guidance that if I were to receive an application and NMFS was to deem that it was warranted that we would take this discussion and we would then have to come back and figure that out probably at a future workload planning discussion, or it depends when we get an application. But at least that is something that I've heard that's been consistent throughout all the comments as opposed to NMFS just doing it. And you're right, the regs technically say we may consult with the Council, but I think we've heard enough here that the Council's strong recommendation is that NMFS does bring that back to the Council when you have an application. We've heard a lot of discussions about when and where that might occur, at which Council agenda item, whether it's consistent with your groundfish processes, and that's where I've heard conflicting views. But I think that core point still has been shared by most everyone who's intervened, including the applicants during their public testimony on day one.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:21] Thank you Ryan. Marci.



**Marci Yaremko** [00:22:23] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Ryan for the additional clarity. And with that I'm absolutely comfortable withdrawing the motion. I appreciate your summary of the next steps.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:41] Marc that's okay, right? Okay, hopefully we have a consensus around here and that's good. I think we do. All right. Okay. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:22:50] And thanks for that Ryan. I really appreciate that. Because when I think about priorities to this Council, priorities to the state of California, I'm thinking of prospective changes to groundfish regulations that will reopen some opportunities that have been missing for some years. And so I think that in terms of benefits to the nation that's something that strikes me as far more important personally.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:27] Okay. Thank you Marc. Okay. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:23:33] Thanks Chair. It seems like we were sort of wrapping up this agenda item. Is that accurate?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:40] Yep that's the hope....(laughter)..

**Corey Ridings** [00:23:40] Okay. Well, hopefully in brief, I have another motion, if I may? Hopefully it's a short one.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:50] I hope...(laughter).. Please go ahead.

**Corey Ridings** [00:23:51] Okay, the tower of power, great. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the advisory body reports under this agenda item for refinement and application of criteria to the identified Council actions to determine their alignment with the EO and the prioritization thereof as outlined in the Situation Summary for this agenda item and further Council action in September.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:14] Is the language accurate?

**Corey Ridings** [00:24:16] It is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:17] Okay. Looking for a second? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Thank you. Please speak to your motion.

**Corey Ridings** [00:24:21] Thanks Chair. This is just kind of recognizing we had a little bit of a garbled process today and earlier exchange with Aja and her first motion and then the decision to turn the second motion into guidance and come up with a process plan and this is just kind of checking the box and recognizing that we did have several advisory body reports and I wanted to just provide clarity moving forward that those reports should be considered for inclusion by Council staff and NMFS staff over the summer as they work on this for putting in sort of that first bucket to go into a table. Of course, I read the Situation Summary as saying that there is latitude for the staff and for NMFS to interpret that and come back to the Council in September with

recommendations, whether it be in a draft table or other. So this is just making sure that those are included in the process that goes forward this summer.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:25] Okay, very good. Questions for the motion maker? Discussion? Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:25:33] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a question for you Miss Ridings. Could you help me understand what this does that's different from the motion we adopted earlier this morning?

**Corey Ridings** [00:25:45] Thanks Director Burden. I think earlier I had asked Aja when she did her first motion, you know which is a series of thoughtful bullet points, was did this include everything that the advisory bodies had put forward in their reports? And her response at the time was that it did some, but not all, and that a second motion was going to be forthcoming. So just recognizing that that second motion didn't end up becoming a motion, but was guidance and might move through the process slightly differently. Just wanting to sort of cross T's and dot I's that those advisory body reports would be included in that first bucket, sort of as described by the Situation Summary. And I realize there's probably some overlap there. Sorry, I should have said that initially. I suspect there's some strong overlap with what was in the motion, but just being specific, if anything wasn't but was in the advisory body reports that those also be included.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:49] Okay. All right, discussion? I'm not seeing any discussion. I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:26:55] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:56] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passage unanimously. All right, thank you Corey. All right, Kelly quickly before someone raises their hand.

**Kelly Ames** [00:27:10] Thank you Chair Pettinger. Just a quick recap here on the work you've done this morning. You've provided guidance on the range of actions to be collated and prepared for your September briefing book, where we will be taking final action on the Council's response to the Executive Order. Further recall earlier we had this motion 2 that was pretty far-reaching. That motion was withdrawn, but we understand there'll be some efforts afoot over the summer to take those ideas that were in that motion and flush them out a little bit further, and we're anticipating that would be a Council member report in the September briefing book for broader digestion and consumption, and we can determine at that time which parts of that might be relevant to our formal response to the EO or just in our communications to the NMFS AA at a future meeting. I do want to point out, because I know it has been a question, for the September Quick Reference we are anticipating that every advisory body will have an opportunity to comment on those materials in the September briefing book. You'll see under workload planning many groups are anticipated to meet online in advance of the meeting, so I do believe we'll have some robust opportunities for advisory bodies and public comment to weigh-in before you take final action. And then just on the last measure I heard some good dialogue. I'm pretty clear I believe, as Ryan noted, that he has heard that the Council is very interested to engage further on any EFP

applications that the agency might receive. So with that, I believe you've completed your work here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:04] Okay Kelly. Thank you.

### 3. Research and Data Needs – Final Action

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That's all of our reports. There is no public comment to take on this so that will take us to the simple, the one task here before us, adopt final research and data needs. And who will I call on to start that discussion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:27] Thank you Vice. I don't want to jump ahead of any discussion, but just noting I have a motion if and when we're ready for that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:36] Let me make one more call for hands on discussion. Not seeing it so let's have a motion.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:49] Okay, thank you Vice. Thank you tower of power. I move to adopt as final the research and data needs as described in Agenda Item D.3.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:11] Thank you. I followed along. That language appears accurate and complete.

**Corey Ridings** [00:01:15] It is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:01:16] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by, I've got lots of hands to choose from, Sharon Kiefer. I saw that one first. Please speak to your motion.

**Corey Ridings** [00:01:30] Thanks. Just noting a lot of good work that went into this for multiple advisory bodies over multiple meetings Including a new process that was laid out for us a few meetings back by Council staff. So just reflecting that that is visible here as we get to final action and appreciative of all that work This motion includes the edits from the SSC that Director Burden spoke to just a moment ago and the EWG as described in both of their reports This is a newest step for the Council's research and data needs by setting and describing priorities, which is a change from our previous sort of long list and database that we have. And I hope that this can stimulate and support science and data collection that reflects the most important needs of the Council right now.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:22] All right, thank you. Any questions for clarification on this? No questions for clarification. Discussion on the motion? I see Corey Niles getting ready. Corey.

**Corey Niles** [00:02:38] Keeley told me I couldn't pontificate past 6 o'clock so.....(laughter).....but seriously, thanks to all the work that went into this, and yeah, Merrick, and thanks to Merrick and Marlene for coming up with a different way of doing this. I think it's been a bit of a holy grail. This is probably the third or fourth iteration I've been through here. It seems, yeah, impossible to get to that list of what's our highest priority and any kind of specificity of what the research and data needs. But I'm just going to quickly reflect on something Merrick said and what he heard at the CCC. And I'm wondering if this, and I'm thinking also to the discussions we've heard related to from NMFS about their ability to manage whatever, 500 whatever stock is across the country,

and I really, as I said at the time, appreciated how Sam Rauch said it like, if you're going to have a species in the FMP, then you want to know the data you need to manage it. First, I don't know if there's an exception in the Magnuson Act for that if you determine a species needs conservation and management. But yeah, how well you can do it depends on the data. And I was not hearing a lot of appreciation for how it all works on the West Coast. And I'm.....yeah, again this is....the SSC and everyone spent a lot of time on this, but I don't know if you read this that you understand where the landings data comes from, from the commercial fisheries and how the PacFIN budget supports that, or all of the.....I'm going to ask Butch about the coded wire tags that make the salmon fisheries run and the recreational surveys that make our recreational fisheries run, and then all of the otolith collections in the bottom trawl survey. So I just, I don't know that this is going to accomplish that and teach people how our data collection works and what species it applies to and not, but it is....I know people have been at Pacific States have been making more of an effort to explain how that PacFIN budget helps us. And I think it's, I think I've, also thinking of the efforts that we've seen from industry writing letters to Congress trying to explain the importance of it, and folks like Butch going back to try to explain it. But it really is important to explain to people where the data comes from and where the budget in particular comes from and how all the state and federal cooperation and tribal cooperation come together. But okay I will leave it there. And yeah, thanks again to everyone for all the work on this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:35] All right, thank you. Other discussion regarding the motion? Seeing none I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:05:50] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:51] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. And is there any further discussion regarding this? Keeley I'm watching my clock, it's getting close to 6 o'clock here in my time zone so.....(laughter)....no other discussion to be had. Marlene, is there more we should do?

**Marlene Bellman** [00:06:24] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. The Council has completed their task of adopting the final research and data needs for this review cycle. It will work with your Executive Director on completing this task through the COP on reporting out these research and data needs to the relevant parties. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:48] All right, thank you. With that, I will close out this agenda item and turn the gavel back to the Chair.

## E. Groundfish Management

### 1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] And that completes the reports of public testimony and takes us to our Council tasks, which is simply discussion, any guidance as necessary. I'm going to look first to Corey Niles to see if he wants to start this and then Aja.

**Corey Niles** [00:00:16] Aja might have had her hand up first.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:17] No I didn't.

**Corey Niles** [00:00:18] Okay. No this is not the time to have it where it's 4 o'clock, but I think Sarah said it. The whiting model is the model we wish we could have for everything. My first stock assessment cycle was 2007. I came in the middle of it, but it must have been 2009 where this is something we lost that long ago was we had, we had a representative from every stock assessment team, you know, whatever five or six there were, come to the Council for Q&A on the floor. That got moved to evening sessions, and then we glossed that because of the pandemic. I should have asked Jeremy and Craig what the plan was for September because it is that dialogue between the back and forth that really helps. If you ask a stock assessment person, I've asked as many of the how the heck could this be possible questions since over 2007 and they always have an explanation of like the sablefish one about we spent two decades thinking it was in the precautionary zone and then two times ago or three times ago and now said it was never there. So but these things all have explanations if you get that dialogue going and they have that at the whiting. Sorry, I'm trying to keep this brief. And I am....we're hearing one side of the story here and I just think if you give these people.....everyone talking together they understand. But I know I was at the STAR Panel for yellowtail and I have explanations of why, what the fishery is seeing might be plausible. But there was a data pre-assessment workshop, which I know the stock assessors worked really hard to get people to engage in where it's meant to do what Sarah is asking for, and yeah maybe it's too early or it's not the right time. So my point is that I think the intent is there on both sides and just how we make it work and pointing to the effort that Director Burden has started by hiring consultants to help us evaluate this process. I hope everyone's taking the time to get their input there. And lastly, I know, and Gerry Richter was doing a really tough job of trying to represent everyone's point of view at the STAR Panel as the GAP rep, but that's always there. And Kiva was one of the stock assessment authors spent days working on a CPU model from the trawl logbooks and the STAR Panel spent the whole Thursday morning talking about those and asking the questions of the type Sarah was wondering about and nobody was there other than Gerry to answer those questions, and I understand there's reasons for that, but they spent a lot of time asking about why would the fishery behave like this and that and then it was like, it was people that didn't know what they're talking about speculating rather than the folks that are on the water having there to provide perspective. So I, again, I think if we pull together and find opportunities there's intent on both sides to do that and it's been a bit frustrating to watch. And yeah, hopefully this consultant review helps us get back to where.... last comment, I used to see Brad and Pete Leipzig there all week at STAR Panels talking to everybody on the sidelines and getting their

perspectives in and I think the pandemic we kind of lost that. So yeah, sorry for going on so long there, but I think we have a long conversation at some point in the future on this topic.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:52] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:03:55] Thank you Vice-Chair. And yeah, I wanted to more deeply thank Jeff. I know that he put in a lot of effort to gather perspectives from industry during the data gathering stage of the assessment and to share that information back and forth with the Science Center as well. Also, thanks Sarah for her comment just now offering suggestions for how to improve that process or the process in some ways, and I think that can feed into the contract that Executive Director Burden just outlined that we're going to embark on to investigate the stock assessment process a little bit more. But I went to the, I don't know that we covered it in this session today, but the Council member ongoing development session back in March, and one of the things that I learned from the South Atlantic Council, and this kind of ties to what Sarah was saying about expertise and what we consider expertise and what we consider legitimate in terms of data sources, but the South Atlantic Council has a process where industry and the SSC work together to really bless data sources that come in through fishermen knowledge and start including them more officially in the process. And I think it sort of elevates the information that fishermen gather more to this space of expertise in this activity rather than it being like a story that's told over top of the information to explain it that way. And so I hope one place that we can go is, yeah, trying to create better space for the that information in the process so that it can feed in appropriately, and especially with money being tight as folks are mentioning all day today, I think that that's the place that were going to have to go a lot more in a lot more concerted way in the future. And I had one more thought that has escaped me now but.....but yeah, the South Atlantic Council model, if anyone wants to look at it is available online. They started to talk. They have a pretty detailed discussion of how they do that there. And then, yeah, that was the other thought that I had. I agree, it's this back and forth that's necessary. It's really hard obviously for, you know, I know that industry was there on the first day of the assessment and was around and I think waiting for the opportunity to comment, but then by the time the discussion rolled around to a place where that input would have been helpful context for the conversation, they weren't there anymore, but I mean it's in part because it's a lot of time for industry to take out of the day to come and sit and wait around at a meeting to maybe be called on to add context to something. And so I think that has to be a really big consideration as well as like, how do we mesh these different working styles with each other? Especially given that.....I also know that NOAA has the constraint now that they can't just stay. You know I think in the past it may have been possible to extend work hours in a different way, now that's not the reality either. So we've got to blend all these different realities together to be able to get information back and forth between the groups. So that's it. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:14] Thank you. Any other discussion? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:07:17] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I can't help but jump in here with a little bit of silver lining I think that we're feeling here in California with the release of the draft quillback assessment and how that process has improved since our 2021 data-moderate assessment that we've been living under since fall of 2023. I think, you know, I really do appreciate the efforts that the Council has made and the idea of having a contractor review our process is a good one and I'm really looking forward to that. But I do want to acknowledge that I think some things have

changed just this cycle that I've recognized and want to shout out to the Science Centers for I think listening to some of our concerns that we've aired that are very similar to these same concerns that we've heard today about getting more on the water real information into stock assessments. I want to thank the Council too for the scheduling of the December ROV methods review meeting, accepted practices, guidelines, and how that has really, I think, moved the ball forward to look at some additional data streams and build them in that, you know, weren't part of prior assessments. The pre-assessment data workshops, and those have been mentioned as opportunities for dialogue, though it's not a, you know, a perfect system, I just, I think we are on the right track and I just want to mention that. I feel very much for Jeff and Sarah having lived that situation here with quillback over the past four years, but I am encouraged that progress is being made and I think some of the discussion here today will feed into the future and then when we review that analysis received by the contractor I think we'll have an opportunity to consider additional recommendations. So just thank you and looking forward to continuing the discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:52] Thank you Marci. Further discussion? And I'm not seeing any on this topic. We've had a lot of discussion, obviously this, the NMFS Report, but a lot of discussion on the stock assessment process, which is a living document. We have the review undergoing. We've heard a lot. We've added some suggestions to our portfolio of improvements to that public comment and discussion here so remember that. We certainly will come back to this in the future. And I'll look to Todd and see if there's anything else we need to do here?

**Todd Phillips** [00:10:36] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So you have heard from the Center, you have from the Region, and the GAP as well as had some public comment. You had the discussion regarding the stock assessments as well some of the presentation material. I would say that you have adequately addressed the task at hand and can conclude this particular agenda item. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:56] All right, thank you all. That'll close out this agenda item.



## **2. Limited Entry Fixed Gear Actions: Gear Endorsements, Cost Recovery, and Other Administrative Changes – Final Action**

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That completes our reports and public comment, takes us to our Council tasks. And in a few seconds they'll pop up, there they are, Adopting a Final Preferred Alternative and FMP language. And with that I'll look around to see who wants to start the discussion on this item? Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:00:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just want to make a couple of remarks. One, because we are at final action and I'm not sure that I have said this yet on this action, but I want to recognize the amount of work and the high quality work that have been put together by the analytical team. In particular, Jessi has done some incredible work on this analysis that has moved through the Council process, and a really excellent NMFS support team helping work through some of these big questions. This has been always the model that we envisioned under the Regional Operating Agreement and it's lovely to see it work and so I just want to recognize that. I also want to briefly touch on, because really in my view this is the big part of this action and what has been really challenging to try to make sure we capture appropriately in the analysis, but is looking at that entanglement risk and coming back a little bit to that discussion that happened between Dr. Lent and Jessi about how we talk about the potential change and really noting some of the language used in the analysis, right, is NEPA language, you know mild effect, moderate effect, but really coming back to the general premise, right? Which is that in the sablefish pot fishery there are very few attributed entanglements, right? It is a low number, right? They're rare and so it's still hard to tell at sometimes, you know, like why things are happening, right? And what might change and if that might change entanglement risk, but overall, right, coming back to the baseline is low and we don't think that this action is going to change that baseline that much, but we have to acknowledge, right, that there's that possibility. And in general too, you now we're confident in the conclusion that this action is not significant. So I think the analysis does a really good job of trying to lay that out, but I wanted to add a little bit sort of more flavor into how we thought about those effects and just making sure that everything that we do, right, is we're being very clear about what could happen, but I think there's a really job of what, trying to predict what may happen, which I think is a little less than what could happen. So thank you for that analysis, and I wanted just to sort of touch on that and come back to that particular piece for the Council.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:44] Thank you. Other discussion? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:02:49] Thank you Vice-Chair. I had a call from Mr. Bob Eder this week. He had some similar concerns about the entanglement risk, and that got me thinking and sent me down a weird rabbit trail and thank you to Miss Waller for talking me through some of that. My main experience with pot groundfish fishing was pot cod off of Kodiak out of Dutch Harbor, which is a very different animal, so I was picturing a whole bunch of people switching to fishing six buys with a single buoy on each pot. Mr. Lapham helped me this morning to understand that it's smaller pots that are longlined so I appreciate that help. But as we're moving into the TRT process later this year, keeping in mind the entanglement risk is a concern as we go forward. The other issue that's been brought forward to me, yes we've been working on this a long time, but there is some

concern that with this allowance there may be some difference in the value of the permits, where one permit may currently be worth more, and if people are able to switch will it devalue that one permit? Don't have any recommendations or anything, just wanted to put it on the record that that was a concern that had been expressed to me by a fisherman this week. But I agree with the amount of work that the analytical team, Miss Waller, I'm assuming probably Miss Summer was involved, and I'm not sure who else at NMFS, but this was a large body of work. And for Jessi to get through 44 slides in about 23 minutes was pretty impressive.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:24] Thank you Lynn. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:04:27] Thank you. I also want to offer some appreciation for the work that's gone into this and, you know, this followed on after the Limited Entry Fixed Gear review as Jessi showed us in that timeline. And also just echo what Miss Kent said about how this should work and really excited to see information that we learned from a review turn into changes to the fishery that we're hearing from stakeholders will improve the fishery in many ways. I think I'll reserve other things to say for later. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:10] Thank you. Let me look to my right to see if there are any discussion on this side? Not seeing any, at some point we need motions. So Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:05:22] I do have a motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:27] There it is, go ahead.

**Heather Hall** [00:05:30] I move the Council adopt the recommendations for Limited Entry Fixed Gear actions as presented in Agenda Item E.2.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, June 2025 as the Final Preferred Alternatives. And adopt the FMP language as presented in Agenda Item E.2, Supplemental Attachment 2.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:53] Thank you. I followed along, the language on the screen appears accurate and complete?

**Heather Hall** [00:05:58] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:58] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion.

**Heather Hall** [00:06:04] I think the GAP Report did a really nice job of laying out their preferred alternatives. I really appreciate the time from PPA in March to where we are now at FPA and all of the work that the GMT, or excuse me, the GAP did to flesh out some I think important changes that are reflected in there. Their recommendations here, just noting gear endorsement, Alternative 3, you know maximizing flexibility but also flagging that Suboption A that specifically excludes the entangling nets. Base permit, Alternative 1, no change from March, which is the removal of the base permit designation. Relative to permit price reporting, the thought that's gone into that, this is a change from the PPA moving this one to No Action. And then the season start time, removing the start and end times of the primary fishery in groundfish regulations. And then relative

to cost recovery, Alternative 1, but Suboption A, which is the responsibility of the vessel owner, which we just heard Bob Alverson speak to. I also think the action aligns well with the purpose and need and really meets that flexibility to Limited Entry Fixed Gear participants so they can use their quota in the most efficient way possible, encourage new participation. The action is needed to provide increased flexibility to participants while also reducing administrative burden. And then I also appreciate the changes to the FMP, which we didn't have in the extra time that went into that. So I think that's all captured really nicely in my motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:16] Thank you very much. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:08:25] Thank you very much for the proposal. Can I just confirm that it does include the change to not collecting the permit sale price?

**Heather Hall** [00:08:32] Correct.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:38] Any other questions for clarification? Discussion on the motion? Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:08:50] Thank you. Thank you for the motion Heather. I will be supporting it. I just wanted to take a moment to say thank you to the staff for the analysis and the time that's been spent to do this. But I do want to just take a second to acknowledge the Suboption A for the entangling nets. We had our EC identify that as problematic, not just so much about expansion of that gear type, but as a conflict with some of our California state regs. So the time in between PPA and FPA have allowed us to figure out how to problem solve that. I think we landed right where we're supposed to be so thank you for that. And then I wanted to take a moment to say, while it's hard to de-program acronyms that you've been saying for 10 years, I appreciate all the effort to go through the FMP and do all of the necessary cleanup to make sure everything is tidy. So thank you, and thank you Heather.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:42] Thank you. Any other discussion? Not seeing any I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:09:55] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:56] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much. And we'll have any last opportunity for comments, but first I'll look to Jessi for a summary. Is there more we need to do on this action item list?

**Jessi Waller** [00:10:18] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, y'all have completed your action for today. You adopted your Final Preferred Alternatives for our five action items as well as adopted the FMP language. So after a few years working on this project we can call it complete and we'll work with NMFS to start the next part of this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:37] All right, thank you very much. And maybe I just might note for NMFSs sake here, there was only one motion, but I count maybe five, six, or seven deregulatory

items in there so just so you know....(laughter).... Any other discussion, comments on this? Not seeing any, thank you all for your good work. That will close out this agenda item.

### 3. Inseason Management – Final Action

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] Well we've had a lot of reports and information provided here on the inseason adjustments, its final action. We'll look around to see who wants to start the discussion. Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:00:15] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I wanted to add something to Dr. Lent's comment on what she was talking about, and I'm just going to use some of my....this is my family's 69th year in the charter business which I've only been in 51 years, but I do have some comments on being closed on one fisheries and just moving to another. It's similar to if you take a basketball in an empty gym and just drop it. The first year represents, you still have a salmon fisheries, let's just use that for example. The second bounce, which is lower, represents your good customers that feel sorry for you and they'll try another fisheries, but for the most part that fisheries isn't usually satisfied to them and they've tried it, they've been there, bought the t-shirt, and now it's call us when salmon fishing or whatever the main fishery is opens up. And my point is all geographical areas aren't created equal and you know some of these areas that we're talking about have several million people around within a 50-mile radius and some of the coastal communities don't so, which gives them a little more advantage to doing things like tours and stuff. But if you look lately at Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco and I was horrified. I didn't realize what it looks like now and how devastating that whole region looks. And my point is, you know, we can close these fisheries in a moment's notice but we've got to learn how to open them. Maybe a little more caution, but not months and years until people are gone. You know and you heard, I think it was Jaime or, not Miss Diamond, I'm sorry, talk about having to go offshore where normally, you know, they had some inshore stuff. Well you know a certain amount of customers can take a short trip out, but the more you add on time the more that becomes seasick and those customers go away. And once you start losing your customer base that starts to find other things to do, you just don't turn a light switch on and they'll come back. So in the charter industry you have a lot of work to do even after a reopening of the salmon or what have you, because they've learned to do some other things. So I just wanted to point out that it's not an easy task, and the longer we.....and I'm not saying we delay, but the longer it takes to reopen something up after you've sit on the dock and you've paid your conservation penance, we should try to have the same type of turnaround in opening things. And I just wanted to convey that to let you know that it is, it's simply not a light switch. And I kind of want to correct the 100 charter boats in Westport. It was more like 250, and Ilwaco had 175 at the height, and the coast. And a lot of those very same boats these people talk about are Westport or Ilwaco charter boats or Washington Coast charter boats. So anyway, and we can tell that, you know, once a charter boat came for sale up in Washington it either went to Alaska or down to the Bay Area or California. And we're noticing charter boats being for sale a lot longer now than they were, so you know that's an indication also things are not as robust as they once were in our sister state, you know, down in California. And so, anyway those are just some thoughts and some experiences that I thought it was important to Dr. Lent but also the Council on kind of a just a little thumb sketch on the charter business. But it also it also transpires to the sport fleet. They stop coming and they'll take their boat somewhere else or they'll....you know the wife will say well you don't need to spend that much money on your sport boat, look you're having fun doing this and

maybe it stays in the garage for longer than.....so it does have a, it does have a tumbling effect of negativity in our coastal communities. So thank you Mr. Vice-Chair for letting me babble on.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:28] Thank you Butch. Other discussion? Marc Gorl.....First, Rebecca Lent a response to that, then Marc Gorelnik.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:05:37] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Very briefly, thank you Butch for that information and by no means did I mean to say that, well you can just diversify. What I'm saying is people have to do that because they want to survive. And I admire that chutzpah to get out there and survive, but it's not the way it should be, I understand. And you're right about Fishman's Wharf. While I hadn't been there in maybe 50 years, I thought, oh good there's still some dealers here. People told me it's not what it used to be. So thank you so much for that. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:13] Thanks. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:06:14] Thank you. I've been fishing in California for a long time and it's not just the number of boats that disappeared, the number of fishermen have disappeared. And effort is, at least, you know, from my observation is much lower than it was 20, 30, 40 years ago. I think what we heard from the GAP is a request for some stability, some predictability. It's very difficult to prosecute a commercial fishery and a processing business without that. You know, we don't have that in the salmon fishery, right, because there's no stability in terms of water operations, precipitation, and whatnot, but there should be the ability to provide greater stability, greater predictability in groundfish. We have the trawl fleet under the IFQ program limiting harvest, and similarly we have measures in the non-trawl sector. And also, as I mentioned, much lower effort historically than we had in the recreational sector, at least in California. It sounds like also in Washington. And so I question sometimes when we get assessments that go high, they go low on a given stock, and I wonder should we be reacting so quickly to such negative news because that sort of defeats the ability to have stability. Certainly there are times when stocks do get hammered either by excessive fishing effort, which we've done a lot to restrict, or perhaps by environmental factors, but I do think we need to step back when we as a Council take measures that will negatively and seriously impact coastal communities, whether we should moderate those efforts in order to provide greater stability. I'm heartened by the draft assessment of quillback. I think that better reflects what those of us on the water and those of us who looked at the last assessment, but I don't want to go backwards, I want to go forward. And I'm hopeful that between NMFS and the California Fish and Game Commission and the department will be able to unwind some of that and try to return opportunity, which, and I think as Butch points out, that opportunity is not regained very quickly and there will be lasting harm from it, but the first step is to get that opportunity back. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:19] Thank you Marc. Other discussion? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:26] Thank you Vice-Chair. This is a question for NMFS. We've seen the draft quillback off California assessment, it came out, what, on Monday? What is the timeline or what is the procedure to react to that since it's still a draft? I think that might, having some information on what we can do and when might help some of our discussion. And sorry if I'm

stealing some of Marci's thunder, but I think will help some of our discussions on what sort of timeline to react legally do we have?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:11] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:10:11] Thank you for the question Miss Mattes. Yes, this point that we're at right now there is a draft assessment that is out in the public arena. We do need to go through the review process, the STAR Panel review process, and then the adoption process through the Groundfish Subcommittee and then the SSC. There are two things that happen with assessments. We look at both the SSC determination of whether or not an assessment is the Best Scientific Information Available for use in management and status determinations. The agency also makes an independent determination of the same thing. We certainly have flexibility on the agency side of our part of that, but we don't typically go ahead of the SSC. So for quillback we need to go through the STAR Panel, which is scheduled soon, and then we need to have the Groundfish Subcommittee and the SSC approve that. And we think we can align the agency part of that as well. We need those steps in place to be able to react, but we certainly under inseason could look at making changes that are then staged and ready to go once we have those pieces, right? So I'm certainly supportive. The agency is very supportive of looking at all of the opportunities to release that fishery assuming everything goes through the review and comes out the other end in the same way of being able to move much quicker than our specifications process. Inseason is one step of that. There are other steps that we will be looking at trying to figure out what the best pathway is, pathways that are not waiting until 2027. I don't have all of those answers yet, but once we get through at least the determinations that this assessment is ready to go, we'll be looking at all of the pathways and certainly keep the Council up to date on what we can do on our end as that proceeds.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:18] Thank you. Is that good? Marci Yaremko.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:12:25] I don't want to cut off discussion, but I am prepared with a few motions at the appropriate time.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:32] Let me take another look around. And I think the discussion can be furthered under a motion. Please go ahead.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:12:41] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think that this exchange with Lynn and Keeley nicely tees up what's next to come. So let's start with the preliminaries with regard to sablefish. We had a report from the GMT and GAP recommending trip limit increases. So with that I would move the Council approve the recommended trip limit increases for Limited Entry and Open Access sablefish north and south of 36 degrees north latitude as described in Agenda Item E.3.a, Supplemental GMT Report 2.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:21] Thank you. That language appears accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:13:24] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:25] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:13:30] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think that the GMT Report and the GAP Report speak to the rationale. And I would note that these are modest increases that were tempered by the need to use precaution in light of wanting to minimize the risk of attainment to our shortspine thornyhead ACL. So the analysis reflects that these modest increases can occur while remaining within those shortspine constraints. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:06] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? And hearing no discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:14:23] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:24] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:14:33] Thank you. Yes I'm ready with a second motion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:36] All right, let's keep going.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:14:41] All righty. As recommended by the GAP in Agenda Item E.3.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, in response to the draft 2025 full assessment of quillback rockfish off California, I move the Council recommend that NMFS proceed with the following inseason management actions for California groundfish fisheries as soon as possible, contingent upon the outcome of the stock assessment review process producing a substantially similar abundance in annual catch limits as those in the draft. Recreational. 1. Restore all-depth fishing in the open season for the Northern Mendocino, San Francisco, and Central Groundfish Management Areas from April 1st through December 31st. Number 2: Remove the recreational management line at Point Lopez that created two subareas within the Central Groundfish Management Area. For commercial. The non-trawl RCA boundary modifications. Restore the shoreward non-trawl Rockfish Conservation Area boundary lines to those in place prior to the actions taken to protect quillback rockfish, specifically for the areas from 42° to 40°- 10', 30 fathoms. From 40°10' to 38 57.5 degrees north latitude, to 40 fathoms. 38 degrees 57.5 to 34° 27', 50 fathoms. Trip limit modifications. Restore Limited Entry Fixed Gear and Open Access trip limits as follows: Modify LE, FG, and OA nearshore rockfish complex trip limits from closed to the following. For 42° to 40°10', black rockfish, 7,000 pounds per two months. For nearshore rockfish excluding black rockfish, 2,000 pound per two month of which no more may be 75 pounds of copper rockfish. South of 40°10'. Shallow nearshore rockfish, 2,000 pounds per two months. Deeper nearshore rockfish, 2,000 pounds per two months of which no more than 75 pounds may be copper rockfish. B: Modify Limited Entry Fixed Gear and OA Cabezon trip limits from closed to unlimited between 42° to 40°10' and south of 40°10'. C: Modify LEFG and OA lingcod trip limits to remove the text, quote, "Seaward of the non-trawl RCA closed inside the non-trawl RCA" end quote. Between 42° to 40°10' and south of 40°10'. D: Modify LEFG and OA other flatfish trip limits to remove the text, quote, "Seaward of the non-trawl RCA closed inside the non-trawl RCA", end quote, between



42° to 40°10' and south of the 40°10'. E: Modify LEFG and OA shelf rockfish complex, excluding bronzespotted rockfish trip limits between 40°10' and 34°27' to the following: For LEFG, 8,000 pounds per two months of which no more than 500 pounds may be vermilion/sunset rockfish. For OA, 4,000 pound per two months of which no more than 300 pounds may be vermilion/sunset rockfish.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:47] Thank you. I followed along. The language we saw on the screen appeared accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:18:54] Yes, that's correct.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:55] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion as needed.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:19:03] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. We're calling this the quillback rollback on the fast track....(laughter).... Okay, first if I may, I'd like to explain the basis for a somewhat unconventional motion under this standing inseason agenda item. I think the dialogue between Keeley and Lynn teed it up quite well. New information became available on Monday and the materials posted on the Council's website for the upcoming stock assessment review of the draft California quillback assessment. That result suggests a much improved perception of the status, not overfished, and indicating that California quillback rockfish are.....and my computer just went to sleep. Apologize. Passwords. So the perception is not overfished and indicating that California quillback rockfish are in a state of healthiness and therefore no conservation risk exists. The STAR review, as we discussed, has yet to happen, but we're encouraged by this much larger body of information that relies on new data from California quillback rather than proxy data from quillback taken elsewhere. It's been a monumental effort over the past four years since that data-moderate assessment was released in 21' to build the body of science and then apply that science and use it in this benchmark full assessment. Cannot say enough words of appreciation to the STAT Team and the supporting scientists and industry members who recognize the data gaps and needs in the earlier assessment and dove in with a commitment to best inform the assessment with new information from multiple sources that were not used in that 2021 length-based data-moderate assessment. So in response to the new science, multiple regulatory actions across multiple venues will be needed to provide relief. We're committed to achieving these rollbacks as quickly as possible, but each of these regulatory actions that need to be taken across both state and federal agencies will require a series of steps. That said, I'm eager to get started today with action here in the Council arena. The science needs to undergo the STAR review, but also needs to be determined as the new best available scientific information by our SSC. First, the Groundfish Subcommittee review and recommendation followed by that of the full SSC. So as it's been explained, NMFS cannot move this inseason action forward just yet should it come to be, but in order for the possibility to be there for them to move it forward, we want to have the Council act on these proposals now in hopes that once we do have the SSC review and the new determination on BSIA, that the rule can move through the administrative processes as quickly as possible once that assessment is available for review and determination on BSIA. So this is a little bit of cart before horse, but I am hopeful that perhaps Council staff can explore the possibility of an SSC review earlier than the September meeting, and perhaps we can get some more information on that later in the week under our workload planning item as to what might be possible in terms of expediting

or moving up that review. The restrictions that we're proposing to roll back today came about through an inseason action process that we took in the fall of 2023, and relied on the analytical document supporting the biennial specifications and management measures. Similarly, this action today to roll back the restrictions will rely on the spex analysis, which evaluates a full range of seasons, depths, and trip limits. Like to take a minute to recognize the folks that commented today from the industry and also those who've previously commented to the Council under our standing inseason agenda item since 2023 about the consequences and the detrimental effects of the earlier quillback stock assessment and how painful the measures continue to be to our fishing communities. We've had testimony about the quillback closures from representatives in Crescent City, Trinidad, Eureka, Fort Bragg, the Bay Area, Santa Cruz, Monterey, and all the way down to Morro Bay. Their testimony that we've received each meeting has been a painful reminder of the consequences felt by the Open Access and Limited Entry Fixed Gear fleets and the recreational fleets throughout northern and central California. The restrictions weren't just about quillback but dramatically affected access, which is what's so important in both state and federal waters to all nearshore and shelf stocks, including nearshore rockfish, shelf rockfish, lingcod, and even to some extent, sablefish. Like to recognize the testimony we heard today. Jimmy Smith commenting about being forced into small areas and now that they're only within 20 fathoms, that access to areas around the Farallons, how important that is to provide area for a large number of vessels. Really, right now they're working with very few options for such a large San Francisco area fleet. We heard from Dave Kasheta talk about the inshore pressure and how much that's increased under the current suite of rules where recreational fishing is limited to only inside 20 fathoms. We heard Tim Klassen talk about how the depth restrictions affect different ports in different ways and that the need is so very urgent to restore depths. We heard William Smith talk about costs in terms of fuel and distance when needing to travel far offshore when only those options are available to them. So I think the extent of the harm that we've incurred across both recreational and commercial fleets, you know these words have been repeated to us consistently and loudly. Just want to also talk for a minute about the state actions that CDFW is currently commencing with as well. As we've talked about since 2023, this is a nearshore situation with a deeper nearshore species, quillback rockfish, that affects nearshore stocks but also shelf stocks and ling cod in state waters and federal waters. So this will require a multiple series of actions to kind of undo the multiple layers of closures and constraints that are effective in the regulations today. Really the most burdensome of the restrictions are actually defined in the state's regulations for state waters which currently limit fishing to inside 20 fathoms and prohibit commercial fishing for federal groundfish in state waters other than fishing that can occur under authority of a state and nearshore permit. So we are working in earnest on two different emergency regulatory actions in the state arena, one for commercial that will be undertaken by the department, and then for the recreational fishing regulations will be proceeding through the Fish and Game Commission. The Commission's meeting earlier this week, testimony was offered by several members from industry offered in support of addressing changes quickly in response to new scientific information about quillback and how important that relief is to our industries. So we're working internally with Commission staff and the department regulatory staff to schedule emergency actions on the state side. Just wanting to note that we are moving ahead full speed on all of these fronts, but the timing of the effectiveness of these various regulatory actions may not align perfectly because we are trying to do them all as quickly as possible. With regard to the specific details of the rollback, the recreational changes moving to all-depth as opposed to the current alternating inshore 20 fathom state waters fishing and offshore of the 50 fathoms fisheries, served to keep anglers from fishing in the prime depths where quillback are

found. That need no longer exists presuming we go through the review process and the outcome is substantially similar to what is contained in the draft assessment. Restoring the depths certainly will serve to spread out fishing effort over a greater area and reduce pressure on nearshore stocks in state waters and provide greater access to healthy abundant shelf rockfish stocks. I also want to speak to the line that exists right now to create two subareas within the Central Groundfish Management Area. That was necessary to prevent ports in the Morro Bay area where quillback have not been found historically from being held to the restrictive regulations that were necessary to avoid quillback rockfish to the north. So now with the quillback perception much differently we no longer need this complexity and restrictiveness of splitting the Central Groundfish Area into two parts. Restoring the trip limits for fixed gear and open access, what this does is just restore them to what they were and in the RCA depths that previously existed before the quillback assessment, that's further up in the motion. The 50 fathoms, 40 fathoms and 30 fathoms, that's the shoreward extent of the RCA once again. You will remember that we did that in response to needing to move the line to again protect quillback in those depths that they're most prominent. So that's it, that's the extent of the actions. We did take these inseason actions over a few steps back in 2023, but this motion here today is intended to roll back the federal regulations that were enacted to provide protection to quillback. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:32:17] Thank you Marci. There's a lot here in this motion. Let me see if there are any questions for clarification on the motion. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:00] Thank you Vice-Chair. Thank you for the very thorough and complex motion and discussion. Just one question. I'm assuming because it isn't spoken to specifically as something that's changing, the current prohibitions on retaining quillback would remain in place since it's not specifically mentioned as something that's being changed. Is that correct?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:00:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for that important clarification. That is correct. We will keep the prohibitions in place for the moment.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:34] I appreciate the clarification. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:39] Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:43] Thanks Vice. Thanks Marci for providing this. Tower of power can you scroll back up towards the top of the motion? Okay, just a little bit down. Thank you. My question is regarding the kind of last part of that paragraph we're looking at that says, "contingent upon the outcome of the stock assessment review process producing a substantially similar abundance and annual catch limits as those in the draft". Marci, can you provide a little more detail on what you were thinking about in terms of what a substantially similar abundance in ACLs mean?

**Marci Yaremko** [00:01:27] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for the question. I think we have been through a number of STAR reviews and those very detailed looks at the draft assessment and then the recommendations for looking at things maybe differently, the process works so that the STAT may do updated model runs based on the input they receive in the course of the discussions at the STAT itself. The goal of course being to produce the best product that we can at the end of that STAR review. And so we expect that meeting to result in some iterations that

could bring some changes to the outcome. It's never a foregone conclusion that those reviews will successfully resolve all of the issues. So I think we would expect that there could be some changes to the outcome of the document at the conclusion of that review. So when I say substantially similar, certainly like above a healthy B 40. And then with regard to the annual catch limits, I believe right now that the draft is suggesting OFL somewhere in the neighborhood of I think 12 or 13. So you know, substantially similar I would say, you know in the neighborhood of, you know thirty-ish percent? That's kind of hard to put a caveat on that, but certainly with the scale and the status in the ballpark that we see in the draft.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:32] Thank you.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:03:32] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:33] Other questions for clarification? And it appears that there are no more questions for clarification, which takes us to discussion on the motion. Any discussion? Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:03:51] Thank you Vice-Chair. I just want to briefly thank Marci for bringing forward this motion as we've gone through the discussion a bit or the questions a bit. I appreciate the caveats of needing to go through the process. Absolutely support looking at whether there's opportunities to even speed up the process and having this staged and ready to go. We are very interested in looking for every opportunity to get fishermen back out on the water once we have that, the appropriate steps in place, that the assessment is accepted and ready to use. So I appreciate Marci you bringing this forward now and I think it is absolutely appropriate to stage it and have it ready to go for as fast relief as we can provide.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:34] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:04:36] Thank you very much, and I appreciate the discussion about timing. I'd just ask, is it likely that this follow-up review will happen before September, our September meeting? If this passes here today we might need to tweak it in September. Will we even know? Just thinking what are the odds that we'll have the STAR Panel and all that by September? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:05] I'm not sure. I would weigh-in that I think we have a workload piece of this to go, but Keeley were you wanting to raise your hand and respond to that?

**Keeley Kent** [00:05:17] Sure, I could just lay out what the existing timeline is. So the STAR Panel right now is scheduled for the week of June 23rd, right? So it's coming up very fast. So that STAR Panel will go through the review. There's additional work after the STAR Panel, then it comes to the Groundfish Subcommittee, which I believe is scheduled for August 11th and 12th, and then would go to the SSC, which would meet right in conjunction with our September meeting. So we would go through that process. Normally in a spex process, right, there is a longer play-out and the Council adopts the stock assessments and things like that. We don't have to wait for some of those steps here, so I think, you know, we're open to looking at opportunities to move any of those steps up earlier than September if possible, but, you now the STAR Panel will be, is coming up

very quickly. That will be the start of this whole process to really whether or not that, if the SSC could meet earlier than September, which I heard Marci request more information and I assume we would talk about under future workload planning.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:26] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:06:29] Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman, and just building on Miss Kent's response here, I did hear Miss Yaremko look at me and ask if we could look into the possibility of a, I guess a special SSC meeting before we get to September. So we'll look into that, see if that's a realistic possibility, and have some more information for you under your workload planning agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:55] Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:06:57] Thanks Vice. I think this is a question maybe for Todd, and maybe even for Keeley. Is that okay? Okay. I'm struggling a little bit here with the process element of this. Just thinking about everything that came out of the last quillback stock assessments and the concerns we've heard voiced about our stock assessment process in general. Something that's top of mind for me is transparency, robustness, and while I really appreciate where this is coming from, in line of thinking of that transparency, I'm struggling a little bit with sort of like, what pieces would we be missing if this is moved forward and then executed hopefully? I'm thinking about analytical pieces. Are there opportunities for the public or the GMT or the GAP to weigh-in on this that they would traditionally have if we were not planning to sort of do this fast track? Just looking for a little advice, help me understand. You know, are we bypassing any of those opportunities and what would those opportunities would look like?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:09] Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:08:11] Thank you for the question Corey. I am generally assuming that when your question is sort of looking at the inseason action changes, not just sort of the bigger quillback assessment adoption process? I'm getting a head nod. So on the inseason action, I'll just note as Marci laid out, right? These changes are all within the range of what has been analyzed and specifications. So as in any inseason, right, there are many different scenarios laid out in the recreational fisheries, in the commercial fisheries that give us this broad range of what we could do. So the evaluation of these potential changes, right, has occurred through that spex process. I am comfortable with where we are on that. I would also note too, right, we do that check and making sure that the public has been on notice that we can make those changes. And on a situation like this, right, where we're looking for opportunities to move quickly, I would also note, right, in September and November, right we'll have successive opportunities to take a look at things. I think, right, we are covered from an inseason perspective, but as we look at how we change back there are opportunities to tweak going forward in the other subsequent inseasons. So that also, right, we have lots of looks and opportunities if there is something that we hadn't contemplated to be able to come back to this.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:47] Thank you. Other discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:09:54] I just want to briefly thank NMFS and the Department and the Council for undertaking this. We....I think we're sort of obligated to unwind that which we can based on Best Scientific Information Available and the willingness of these agencies to move on this with due respect to process is greatly appreciated.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:27] Thank you Marc. Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:30] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I remember when we declared this stock overfished I believe. It was remotely, I believe. It was in Portland. We were having Jaime Diamond come online and give a heart-wrenching account of what this is going to do and how I just, I almost wanted to give her a hug but I couldn't because we're thousand miles away, but it's just, and there was nothing we could do at that time. I remember when we had this discussion and we closed this fishery down in the state of California waters, like from September on, right? Throwing people out of business. And so I think we have an obligation to do as much as we can as quick as we can. There's enough injury that happened here to those communities, those businesses, and I think that I would hope there'd be no pushback on those individuals or committees, whatever, I mean now's the time to step up and get this right. So thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:11:31] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:11:33] Thank you very much. And I sure appreciate these efforts to carry out what we said we were trying to do, you know when it's bad news, when it's good news. I apologize if I missed this, but at the very top the phrase that Miss Ridings pointed out, can we scroll to the top about the substantial difference? And thank you to Keeley and the Council folks for trying as hard as you can to everything done before September. When does the decision get taken about whether it's hit this threshold of substantially similar abundance and who makes that decision? Would that have to happen at the Council in September? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:20] Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:12:22] Thank you for the question Rebecca. My read of Marci's statement in there, which was added with a request from us and Council staff that, right, it's more laying out that there is the possibility, right? So we're not foreclosing what happens in the review. There is a possibility that that review can happen, right? And, you know, two things can change in particular that would probably affect how we think about this inseason, right? So one would be, you know, the final model runs that are determined the best for that assessment and what ultimately comes out of the STAR Panel and then is adopted by the subcommittee and then the SSC could show that, in fact, it was overfished in the past and it may still be below B 40, right, that you could have a scenario that it's right at B 39. That will change a bit how we look at things, and I'm not saying I know at this moment, but I think the motion gets a little bit at that, that there may be different pathways that we look at having something that, if an assessment shows that it was never overfished even if it's in the precautionary, you can move more quickly to end a rebuilding plan. Separately, if it was overfished but it is still in the precautionary zone, right? So there's just different pathways and I think Marci's motion does a good job of sort of laying out that possibility under an inseason where we're going to be evaluating that information. If the assessment process came back with something different than that, that would be when we come back to the Council.

So right, so what we would come back in September and say, you know, that process turned out differently than what the draft showed and we would have another opportunity to take a bite at the apple. So in my view we're covered on that and hopefully that makes sense and answers your question.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:22] Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:14:25] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And again, just to add to what Miss Kent outlined. I mean anytime the Council takes action it's my job to go then execute that or take the steps to execute it, and sometimes there are some minor judgment calls that we have to make to execute on that. So I think it's more likely than not that there will be some little tweak here or there to the draft. That's what often happens in these stock assessment review processes, and I think that's a good thing because it means the review is working. And so barring any other guidance from you, you know my office consults with Keeley's office and we may want to also consult with CDFW and say, here's this change, do we all agree that it's minor and we should move forward or do we agree it's major and let's wait until September? So that's the process I would intend to undertake unless there's other guidance from you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:15:24] Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:15:25] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Marci just an awesome sauce motion. Very good. And Keeley thank you for willing to do what we need to do here to make sure that we can move forward. The reason I don't just like this motion, I love this motion is we're not opening the fishery up to retain them wide open, so there is that backstop that we have. And to the people that spent the time and, you know, had doubts in us that we would do what we needed to do the right thing, I so appreciate you guys sticking with us and your testimony and your professionalism when you could have certainly thrown rocks at us and you didn't and maybe you should have. But we're getting there and to Jaime Diamond, to what Brad said, yeah she was given that testimony and one of these Oregon staff members started cutting onions behind here. So we are all, we were all....it was great testimony. And so I just wanted to say I'm supporting the motion and proud to do it. I think it's a great motion. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:42] Thank you. Any other discussion? Looking around I'm not seeing any. I want to make sure. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:16:55] Thank you Vice. I didn't want to ask Marci for this clarification because it wasn't really a clarification. But she did say something I wanted to hone in on, and Marci I don't want put you on the spot so if this is a side convo for sure. But Marci mentioned about the effort that CDF&W had done to get data that would go into this stock assessment and I'm reflecting on, you know as we as a Council and we as a west coast scientific enterprise, how we prioritize the data that we need and ensure that it's collected, whether that's done by NMFS or the states or someone else entirely. So I guess my question would be, you know how come that data was not collected prior to 2021? Was it funding in the department? Was it a lack of prioritization that this Council or the department could have done differently? You know, looking long term and for the arc of how we do our best I don't think it's unavoidable, I don't think that's possible, but do our

best to avoid it where possible in the future by making sure we're collecting the data that we really need.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:14] Marci.

**Marci Yaremko** [00:18:15] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you for the question on data. And let me be just excruciatingly clear. This was not a department effort to get to fill the data gaps that were identified in the 2021 data-moderate assessment. Those gaps were identified and filled by, it was a all-in team effort by federal scientists, by industry partners that offered to take researchers out to collect specimens for age, growth, and maturity information. It was our efforts of, yes to some extent, our recreational samples that we collected from surrendered fish that were illegally retained. It was fish that were intercepted that were landed actually as part of the IQ program. There were a few offloads that were monitored where fish were able to be retained and collected. So it was a very concerted effort over a four-year period that allowed this new benchmark full assessment to rely on data that came from California without using proxy data from quillback from other regions of the coast. With regard to the ROV data, that did play a part in this assessment, including that new index. That was a very heavy undertaking by a number of folks at the Southwest Center and combined with CDFW data analysts as well as John Budrick. And I guess I'll reference Informational Report 4 that is in our briefing book that outlines the process and the steps that have been taken to date to build this repository with hopes that we can use that ROV data source into the future in other assessments. So in terms of your question was about how do we avoid the gaps? How do make sure we're doing as much as we can? I think we are doing all we can with the resources we have. I think, you know, a lot of change may be in our future following actions under other agenda items and stock definitions and phase 2 that may refocus our thinking about stock assessment prioritizations and which species we assess and using which tools. I think we've learned a lot from the length-based data-moderate assessments, and now we do have full benchmark assessments both for copper and quillback rockfish. So I think, you know, we've done a lot and, you know I think that we will be having more opportunities and agenda items both here this meeting but also in the future when we're prioritizing stock assessments that we do have opportunities to consider the robustness of the data that is available for use in stock assessments.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:08] Thanks Marci. And before we go further on that, I apologize, it's an important question and a discussion, but it's not at this point germane to the action in the motion. So I want to make sure we discuss everything important to the motion at this point. And if we can, want to take up data collection related to stock assessments, we can do that at a different time. So discussion specific to the motion before us here? I'm not seeing any so I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:22:53] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:54] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:23:06] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I wanted to.....I appreciate all the work you guys did to pull together a faster response on quillback. I wanted to turn to all the other species that were raised today and the issues that industry is facing with those. I really appreciate the GAP



Report, the amount of detail they put into describing the compounding impacts of quota reductions for canary, shortspine, and petrale, and how those impacts are playing out across every single sector. And that call for help about the fear of those compounding impacts was playing out since March. So, yeah, I want to tie back together for everyone the reason why the GAP came forward asking for the Council to prioritize specifications flexibility was because they were starting to see those impacts play out already as they were planning for their fishing years. So they knew.....you know while we weren't really clear at the time that specifications was going forward that, or back in 2024 when we were working on developing specifications that these things would be challenging. Now seeing them actually play out is painting a really different story than we understood before. And in hindsight, it would have been helpful to try to buffer those impacts up front for industry in some way through our management activities. And I think that that's what we're trying to think about with the specifications flexibility action that we'll discuss later this week. And those comments were very distressing. And if all that happened in half a year I don't want to hear what happens after another full year of living under that kind of restriction. So with that, I have a request to.....this is I guess to the Council, to NOAA, and yeah, NOAA both the Regional Office and the Science Center as well, but I'm wondering if to support the Council and thinking about ways to consider acting quickly to relieve some of the distress for some of other species as well, and in response to some of stories we heard today, if we can request that the Science Center add catch-only projections for 2026 for petrale, shortspine, and canary. They're already, the Science Center's already running catch-only projections for those species for 2027 and onward as part of the specifications process, and that's already, that's described in the briefing book later on, their timing for running those larger projections. So I'm asking here to extend back one year to include 2026 so we can think about what that update could mean for this next fishing year. And then tied to that, I'm wondering if the Regional Office and Council can work together with the Science Center on some ad hoc ABC control rules for those species using the updated catch-only projection information and bring that back for September so that we can consider what, if anything, is available to us. So I'll stop there if there are questions about that request or, yeah, I welcome help from everyone in figuring out whether that's possible.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:17] I'll turn to Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:26:21] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And Miss Szumylo, just thinking here about some process. I think what could be helpful is if we treated your question similar to how we treated Miss Yaremko's request, which is give us some time to talk about this and then we can have some more information for you under workload planning and then talk about it there and make some final decisions about whether we can actually do that under that agenda item. Hopefully that works for you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:26:57] Thank you. Other discussion? And I just want to note we started talking about data collection there did.....this is inseason, we do have research and data needs agenda item at this meeting and that might, if you wanted to follow-up, that might be the better place to have that discussion rather than under inseason adjustments. So any other discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:27:24] Since my comment wouldn't be appropriate under research and data needs, and it's brief, I'll make it here. I want to point out that the need for California-specific data only arose when California was defined as a separate stock at the same time basically as that

assessment came out, so the lack of, up until then it was a coastwide stock, so the need of California data arose too late for us to focus on collecting California data. So now that the stock was defined, that effort was made and we have data and we have a better assessment for it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:01] All right, thanks for that clarification. Todd, can you summarize and tell us what else we should do here?

**Todd Phillips** [00:28:10] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So you have heard from the GMT and GAP regarding reports as well as multiple members from the public, had good discussion. In sum, you have approved two motions. One would be the sablefish trip limits for Limited Entry Fixed Gear and OA. And the motion as Miss Yaremko titled it, quillback rollback on the fast track. And then you are also planning to entertain some discussion regarding specific things like a potential SSC meeting. And canary, shortspine, and petrale catch projections that will be discussed under workload planning. My read of the agenda items that you have completed your tasks here.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:57] Thank you. Any closing comments? Not seeing any, then we'll close out this agenda item and I will pass the gavel back to our Chair.

#### **4. Adopt Stock Assessments - CANCELLED**

## 5. Intersector Allocation Review – Final Action

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] So we will move into our Council task which will flash up on your screen, but it's simply, I believe, to adopt the Intersector Allocation Review Report and provide any feedback on that. So with that, is there anybody who would like to start this discussion? Corey Niles. Thank you.

**Corey Niles** [00:00:31] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. First, thanks to Jessi and staff for producing this. I know that's a lot of work. I think Jessi's got a lot more efficient at it. But it has me kind of thinking about this setup that the Magnuson Act requires where we have to do these reviews on a periodic basis, and then the idea is that we then come up with ideas for improvement. It almost kind of assumes that we've just totally ignored the program for the previous five years. So I don't know that this is telling us anything we don't now. And for example, I think I was thinking, sitting here thinking I was looking at Brad and it was probably, I'm going to exaggerate, but two months into the IFQ program where I remember Brad and folks coming in saying, observers cost too much we've got to do something about it. I was like, wait, we just gave you an IFQ Program and you couldn't wait a little bit longer to criticize it. So it's not like we don't think about how to improve things and the industry's not thinking to improve things like every single meeting almost. Just a reflection of a lot of work goes into this, and I think maybe as the GAP has indicated, in some cases it doesn't get to the level of detail we need, or we usually use to decide if something is needing changes and what alternatives we might look at to help us decide to make those changes. So that's a long way of saying I don't know that asking for more work within this type of document would be worth the staff time or our time. I think if we're wanting to change allocations then we move into our typical process for doing that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:41] Thank you. Further discussion? All right, I'm watching hands go up. Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:02:50] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Jessi for the report. And I really appreciate the big poster caveat that there's a date cut-off here that isn't reflecting our current biennium and the current situation we have with a few of our very important key species that are going to be more problematic as we move forward. But I think I'm in agreement with you, Corey, that this is a good springboard. It's initiating some discussion, but otherwise we have a mechanism where we can tee this up in our specifications process that's been working relatively well. So I don't see a need to expand upon this at this time, but to bring it back up in September and put it in the context of those species where we might need a little bit more digging and a little more investigation. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:43] Thank you. I'm going to look to my left and see if Lynn Mattes wanted to weigh-in?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:03:48] Thank you Vice-Chair. The reason I was pointing to Caroline and put my hand down is I don't want to preclude discussion, but when it gets to the time I do have a motion ready. But I think Miss Kiefer may have a question or comment first.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:02] Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:04:05] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am in agreement generally with both Corey and Caroline about this. Is quite a bit of work and I think provides the technical information we need. But I would notice that the GMT had made one technical recommendation, and not so much dealing with numbers, but more just a clarification of a particular point. I'm assuming that would not be too difficult for you to integrate?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:43] Jessi, did you want to respond?

**Jessi Waller** [00:04:46] Mr. Vice Chair, Miss Kiefer. No, I think their, you know, depending on where the Council wants to go with this, that's a very easy thing that I think staff, I could add in the clarity and if I see any other little typos or whatever, can fix that after the meeting with the Council's blessing.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:03] All right.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:05:04] Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:04] Thank you. That might be covered in a motion anyway. Let's make sure. Not seeing any other hands, so Lynn why don't you go ahead with that.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:05:14] Thank you Vice-Chair. Learning from my GMT colleagues yesterday I tried to make this a really short motion. So I move the Council adopt the Intersector Allocation Review Document, Agenda Item E.5, Supplemental Revised attachment 1, June 2025.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:35] Thank you. That's brief and it looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:05:40] Yes sir it is.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:42] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Aja Szumylo. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:05:48] Thank you Vice-Chair. I think some of the comments that others made show that this is a pretty thorough document. There are some caveats that both the GMT and GAP have mentioned that I think we'll be keeping in mind as we move along. It's not a formal part of the motion but I hope we can provide guidance to Council staff to make any technical corrections as needed, such as the misspelling here and there and the one that Miss Kiefer pointed out from the GMT, hopefully those are within bounds within this. And I don't know that I need to say much more.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:29] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? No questions. Discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:06:41] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:41] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you for that. And Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:06:55] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thanks Lynn for the motion. Speaking to the GAP Report of the interest in canary rockfish. I do think that the, not having my agenda numbers memorized, I think E.8 we will be bringing up canary rockfish and we do have, we had interest in looking at that last spex cycle. Just the gist for people who don't remember that was that since the canary ACL increased tenfold back in 2017, we don't think we ever had the fair and equitable discussion among all the sectors and how that has affected our recreational fishery in particular, and the analysis didn't go like we thought it would go, hoped it would go in the last cycle. And so we're thinking we might need, not result-wise, just even being considered in the fashion that we thought would be justifiable, and so at that point a number of times we said, do we need another process besides our biennial process to do that more thoroughly? And the information we've been getting on the side is, let's try again in the biennial process as something to propose there. So just wanting to note that we did see that in the GAP Report, but E.8, if I'm reading this right, is where we can talk about, we will propose that more thoroughly.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:41] Thank you Corey. Please go ahead.

**Corey Niles** [00:08:44] Apologies. A last....an important point. I think we also think that the E.7, the flexibility item, which I'm going to try to avoid rhyming, is another place where at canary, addressing the pain that canary is causing various sectors is another place we'd like to bring it up. So, excuse me for forgetting that point.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:08] All right, thank you for foreshadowing those couple of items there. Any other discussion to be had here? Otherwise I'll look to Jessi for a wrap-up.

**Jessi Waller** [00:09:23] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, you have completed your action for today. So we will work on getting those few technical corrections to the Interceptor Allocation Review Document done and we will get that posted to the Council website. So it is final.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:09:39] All right, thank you. Multiple years, big chunk of work done there. Thanks to everyone who contributed to that.

## 6. Phase 2 Stock Definitions — Final Action

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] We're going to start off on E.6, and I'll turn to Todd Phillips and Katrina Bernaus to get us going. I'm not sure who's going first, so please.

**Todd Phillips** [00:00:10] Thank you Mr. Chair. Good morning Council. Yes, we are indeed at the second part for Phase 2 Stock Definitions. Just to orient the Council, yesterday you heard from both Katrina and myself regarding the overall analytical documents. You heard from the GMT, the GAP, the SSC, the Habitat Committee. You had some public comment and some very little discussion here around the table. And we are now set to take action, action for this action.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:44] Okay. Questions for Todd before we go on? So with that I'll open the floor up. So Keeley, I see your hand. Good morning.

**Keeley Kent** [00:00:53] Good morning. Yeah, I was hoping to make just a few remarks as we get the discussion going. Trying to reflect on the reports that we heard last night and the public comment and just wanted to take a moment to reorient. Will take obviously an opportunity to thank the staff on all of the work on the documents for the briefing book. This is a lot of work that has been done to bring forward to the Council. And then all of the the GMT, the GAP, The SSC, the HC, all of those discussions, which I had the ability to sit in on a lot of those rooms, right, the thoughtful consideration of these very challenging policy questions, right, and this point that we're at where we're looking at a potential paradigm shift in what we do, right? That is hard and there is a lot of history in sort of how we've been doing things, so I want to recognize that. I think there's lot of good information that has been brought forward and I hope folks around the table keep coming back to the analysis, right? And there's a lot of information in there that supports a change, in my opinion, right, as I read that. But I'm hopeful that we can ground ourselves in what's in those documents and that analysis that we've done a thorough look and we have one more shot, right, to bring even more forward. So to the extent that there's interest in something more, right, that specificity will really help us get to September on the second part of this action. We have been working on this for a very long time. So there are new changes for the administration and new priorities, but we've been working on this three years, right? So I also want to ground us in, I think we're looking at this in a very thorough and holistic way and asking the really hard questions, right? This is central to what Councils do. They make the determination of the stocks that are in need of conservation and management in the EEZ. I would just remind folks that that in the EEZ is really what we're looking at. It does not mean that fish in state waters are not important, but that's not the question we're asking here. So I think the framing is really important. I do think we've gotten a lot of great information and a lot careful input and I feel confident in where we are now in being able to consider these hard questions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:16] Okay, thank you Keeley. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:03:17] Thank you Chair Pettinger. I appreciate the opening remarks there. And I think you hit on a key point is the change in administration. From my perspective, some of the discussions we've had this week and some of discussions we're going to continue to have this

morning I think are different now than they would have been if we were doing this a year ago. Just some changing perspective with the agency, some changing priorities, interpretations. I did listen in on the CCC meeting discussion about the 550 species in the FMP and how that's not sustainable. Also listening to Mr. Rauch, Sam speak the other day, that that is not sustainable, that the agency doesn't have the resources to manage all of those. I don't think it was intended but a little bit of the messaging there was, we don't have the resources to deal with this so we're going to not deal with it, we're going to deal it with somebody else. That may not have been the intent, but that is a little bit of the message that came across. As part of the messaging, about oh 13, 14 years ago the states were interested in removing nearshore rockfish from the FMP to put into state management, and at that time we had to have very strong background rationale for why we were removing it from the FMP. And now this, where we're at right now, it seems we've kind of gone the opposite route where we have to have strong rationale on why we're keeping something into the FMP. And that did cause a change of thinking for myself and probably some others and it's with that change of thinking that I try to go into this as we move forward there are going to be some tough discussions because it is going to change fundamentally what we do and how, what all species we manage and then that could have some trickle-down effects on our fisheries. When it does come time, I am prepared with several motions to go with this. I'm not cutting off anything, but just letting the group know that there are motions ready when it comes time. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:42] Thank you Lynn. Sharon Kiefer.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:05:42] Thank you Mr. Chairman, and I would just, and I'm sure you've said some of this before, but I would like to ask Keeley a couple of, once again, process questions. One related to, you know, I did sense a general recommendation to not address Ecosystem Component species right now. My question process-wise, is what is the process for integrating Ecosystem Component species? I mean is it relatively easy? Does it have to be done all in one bunch? And also as well as future-thinking as we make decisions, if we do make a decision about a species no longer belongs in the FMP, conditions change such that perhaps a fishery does emerge, targeting, or integrating that particular species, what's the process then? How difficult to add a species back to the FMP?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:51] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:06:51] Thank you for the questions. So at this point that we're at, we're asking this question of, is a stock in need of conservation and management in the EEZ? Depending on the answer to that, so if the answer to that is no, there's then two options. So we've laid them out between Alternative 2 and 3, removal or designation as EC species. There has been a lot of work to get to this point, and really we've been focused on that question, right? I do think there's more that we can develop, and I think it was asked for in some of the reports, and I absolutely think we will dig in there, right, of then you answer that question, no, how do you make that decision between removal versus EC designation? In particular, I've had a few conversations recently where I am very interested in exploring potential additional tools for EC species that we don't already use, and I think that has the possibility to get at some of the concerns that we've heard, you know like in the SSC Report. So that could be brought back in September to better inform the Council of what the possibilities are, right? I think all of this is a species-specific evaluation and we should be thinking about the individual characteristics and potentially looking at different tools. So I think



we have that. I'll assign that task to myself between June and September to bring more information on that, right, but then it would be, you know at this point you're making a preliminary designation for something that your preliminary saying is not in need of conservation and management in the EEZ to whether it's removal for Alt. 2 or EC species. And then if you want to ask for more specific information to help you feel like you have a better way to navigate between two and three, I think that is absolutely appropriate at that stage and then we'll have September to be able to nail that down. And you did have a second and third question. Could you remind me real quick?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:52] Sharon.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:08:52] Post decisions the Council makes now in the future. If we were to see a fishery emerge targeting a particular species that the Council had actually removed from the FMP, is there a process to put it back in because it now is in need of conservation and management?

**Keeley Kent** [00:09:12] Yep, great question. Yes, so now we are going to be very good at asking this policy question and knowing how we analyze it, right? So it's the same question, whether or not a stock is in need of conservation and management in the EEZ. So at any point, right, sort of even outside of this process, that question can be raised and the Council can grapple with that. So it could occur for any species. For a removal species that you might have a different level of information coming in. You know, there's.....when I think about sort of how that could look, could be, you know if the state is managing that species and there's a, you know, a question about a shifting range or something like that that could come to the Council, obviously any member of the public could bring that forward as well. For EC species we have done that actually in the past. Big skate is a good Example of that. That was a species that we had as an EC species. There was an emerging fishery. The Council looked at this question, is it in need of conservation management? And decided that yes, and moved it back into the fishery. So we have done that before and there's a pathway and we're going to keep coming back to that question, and we now, we have a good framework of how to address that.

**Sharon Kiefer** [00:10:23] Thank you for that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:10:26] Thank you Keeley. Thank you Sharon. Caroline McKnight was first so Heather, you're the next. Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:10:31] Thank you Mr. Chair. You got my question before me but I'm going to ask it a little bit differently and I think a little more specific. In the context of what I'm going to refer to as wobblers, maybe some of these deeper nearshore or shallow-shelf species that haven't had full access to all depths in various sectors, that right now the analysis is demonstrating that maybe it's, you know, entirely or predominantly in state waters but that could shift with different depth opportunities. Are you suggesting that that would be something that we would need to bring forward in workload prioritization or some more formal prescribed way that we could evaluate some of these species that we know are attained in the fishery and new information can lend something different? That is different from, I think, some of the other species on the list that have historically with full access have had very little to no mortality or trace amounts interacting with the fishery. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:31] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:11:35] Thanks for the question Caroline. Yeah, so it's a good question to think about. I don't think there is a mechanism where the Council is forced to have, you know like a set review period where they're looking at that, right? That possibility exists now to have anybody ask that question for a particular species. The thing I would come back to too though, is that we looked at principal mortality, which we know is not predominantly. We built in this buffer for what we think could happen if these regulatory closures were not in place. And so the Council can certainly choose whether or not they wanted to look at that. If the Council wanted to talk about a regular review, you could talk about that. I don't think you have to, but I would sort of remind you, right, that we've already anticipated some level of change to where the spatial catch is occurring and tried to build in that buffer. You know how much over the line would that have to change? You know that's something the Council could think about, but I think that possibility is open but would just say we tried to think about that ahead of time so that we weren't sort of in a situation where there was an immediate problem once we get through this action.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:52] Thank you Keeley. Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:12:55] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. Just perhaps even more specific response to your question, Miss McKnight. We do have our Council Operating Procedures, and in particular COP 9, and in there it contemplates this very thing, like is there a process where we undertake a review of our stocks and potentially modify them? And what it calls for is that in the second year of even numbered years, in March our COP says, "The SSC, GMT, and GAP will meet to consider new information related to defining groundfish stocks and provide recommendations to inform Council action on stock definitions as appropriate". And then it goes on to say a little bit more about how we do that. So we actually specifically contemplate asking this question every two years as part of the spex process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:49] Thank you Merrick. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:13:51] Thank you. My question's on the similar thinking about the input that we've had about we can always bring something back into the FMP if we decide it's out. A little nuance though on this one is what if the stock is predominantly in the EEZ but doesn't meet that 25% threshold? And the question is, will we still be getting catch information on that so we have an indicator of, oh wow, catch of rosethorn is going up and maybe we need to bring it in the EFP or there's some new fishery developing for that just hypothetically. How will we know?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:46] Okay, the question is.....Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:14:50] It felt like a question for me so I'll take it. I think it's a good question, right? And I presume you're only thinking about the removal scenario, right? There's a clear, I think a clear under EC species where right now we have, you know, at least annual information that comes forward for the Council. For a species that were to be removed from the FMP, yes, the any monitoring requirement goes away. Really it would fall down to whether or not the state determined that they were going to manage that particular species. The state can manage in the EEZ for a species that's not in an FMP as long as they are permitting those vessels. Right, that

piece of it is uncertain and it's not driven by our Council action so I wouldn't want to speculate too much on what that would look like, but that is sort of the potential scenario that could arise is whether or not the state chose to, in addition to the state portion of that, fish, also grab the EEZ portion, and then bring that information to the Council. So I'm not saying that I'm expecting that. The state doesn't have to do that, but that could be a plausible pathway that could occur.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:07] Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:16:07] Thank you Keeley. I'm talking about species that would be caught in the EEZ, incidental catch, not incidental catch, those stocks that would have been removed because we're not catching them now but maybe if things change, then they are catch. That's the tracking I'm interested in. Thank you.

**Keeley Kent** [00:16:29] Thank you for that clarification. My immediate answer is focused on what I have seen in the GEM Report, which is our annual mortality report which goes well beyond both species in the fishery and EC species, right? When observers are on board those boats they are generally getting information on everything that comes on board. So I am expecting that that process will continue, right? If you ever look at the GEM you'll see lots of very interesting things listed there. So I do think that will continue to be a source of information that we'll be able to see sort of if there are fluctuations over the years with those. And you'll get a signal in a, you know, in the same way that we'd be getting a signal for any EC species.

**Heather Hall** [00:17:17] Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:17] Okay, thank you Heather, Keeley. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:17:21] Thanks Chair. I think this is a question for either Todd or Keeley. Do we have any example in the past of if a species has been removed from the FMP if it has consequently been added back in?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:36] Todd.

**Todd Phillips** [00:17:36] Yes, through the Chair. Yes we do. It was a big skate as Miss Kent acknowledged. We removed it, well I guess we didn't remove it, we determined it to be EC species and brought it back in. I don't know if we've actually removed anything yet and brought back in, so hopefully I'm not confusing you. My brain got going there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:17:58] Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:17:59] Thanks Todd. I'm hearing that big skate was moved to EC and then was moved back, but there's no example of a species that has been fully removed from the FMP and then brought back.

**Todd Phillips** [00:18:11] Not, through the Chair, Miss Ridings not to my knowledge. I would look to someone potentially who has had a longer span here than I.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:30] Okay, very good. All right. Further discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:18:41] Thank you Chair. So I think this question is for staff. The Council has previously decided that this 25% threshold is sort of a proxy for predominantly caught in the EEZ as stated in the regulation. Do I have that right?

**Todd Phillips** [00:19:07] Yes, through the Chair, we didn't use predominantly, we used principally caught as, yes as a....yes, you are correct with the exception of, I guess, terminology.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:19:21] So I'm looking at the staff presentation. Maybe I should have asked this before, but there's a gazillion stocks here and a gazillions factors and so it takes a while to settle in. But the regulation that we're all dealing with here were the multi-factors. Talks about, and I'll use the language of the regulation, talks about predominantly caught in the EEZ and, you know there's a need in conservation, et cetera, we all know the language. But then it goes on to say, "apart from those stocks, you can still include it in the FMP if it meets these 10-factor analysis". And so what I'm wondering is, in the staff presentation, why are we applying our proxy for this predominantly caught in these other factors when you don't even reach those factors if the stock is already predominantly caught? it seems a bit of a feedback loop, so. And if that's not clear. I think Keeley has an answer so....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:42] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:20:42] Thank you. I think I understand what you're getting at. And really it comes back to the National Standards. Note we have to go through the full 10-factor analysis for anything we're considering for removal. So you're right, right? That is the initial focus and there is weighting to the first three factors. We have to through all 10 anyways if we're going to look at removing a species. So hopefully that sort of gets at what you are asking. Maybe I'll just pause.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:21:12] Yes, thanks. Let me give that a little more thought. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:16] Thanks Keeley. Okay, Marc. All right, anybody else? There's always motions to be had for getting discussion going or..... Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:21:32] Thank you Chair. I think we're ready to get this kicked off. In an effort to not be too messy I have tried to take this very complicated action and break it out into sizable chunks. I overuse the analogy. Last time we were talking about this, about taking a bite out of the elephant, try not to go down that road, but do have a series of five motions to try to get through all of the pieces and parts of our Council action listed there. And with that, if the tower could put up ODFW Motion 1. Thank you. So I move the Council adopt as Final Preferred Alternative, FPA, maintaining the following species with already defined stocks in the groundfish FMP: chilipepper, canary, dover, English, lingcod, dogfish, petrale sole, redbanded, rex sole, roughey blackspotted rockfish, sablefish, shortspine thornyhead, vermilion rockfish off Oregon, Washington. Vermilion/sunset off of California, widow, yelloweye, and yellowtail rockfishes. Apologies, I missed squarespot with the scrolling, so that does include squarespot rockfish. And I move to maintain the following species in the groundfish FMP adopting the, adopting as FPA the stock definitions bolded in the below table. For the first list: arrowtooth, aurora, bank, big skate, blackgill

rockfish, flathead sole, greenstriped rockfish, Longnose skate, longspine thornyhead, Pacific cod, Pacific hake, or whiting, POP, Pacific sanddab, redstripe rockfish, sharpchin rockfish, shortraker rockfish, silvergray, splitnose, and yellowmouth rockfish, adopt PPA, which is Option 1, single stock, coastwide. In transferring there appears to be a line that has gotten lost in this table. But for California rockfish and starry rockfish, Option 1 was single stock for California only. Then for species where we considered Options 1 and 2, bocaccio rockfish, Option 1 is the PPA, single stock, coastwide. Cowcod, single stock California only. Greenspotted rockfish, Option 1, single stock, coastwide. And for a species where we considered Options 1, 2, and 3. Darkblotched rockfish, Option 1, single stock, coastwide. And forward rosethorn and stripetail rockfish for a 10-factor analysis as described in Attachment 2 as recommended by the GAP.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:52] Okay. Lynn is the language on the screen accurate? Oh sorry, Lynn, or Keeley?

**Keeley Kent** [00:24:58] Redstripe.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:24:59] Redstripe.

**Keeley Kent** [00:25:01] I think it was missing a letter. Maybe scroll up real quick.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:25:09] Yes, red. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:16] Good catch, very good. Okay, now Lynn is the language on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:25:20] I believe so sir. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:23] Okay. Caroline, is that a second or.....no.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:25:24] Sorry.

**Merrick Burden** [00:25:31] Don't take a second yet.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:33] Okay. What's that?

**Merrick Burden** [00:25:33] Don't take a second yet.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:33] Yeah, I'm not. so please.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:25:35] Okay, I just want to clarify. I think I heard California rockfish as opposed to California scorpionfish. So I just want to clarify that that is written on the screen.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:25:46] That is correct, California scorpionfish. Evidently the caffeine hasn't fully hit my brain yet.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:56] All right, thank you Caroline. Any other edits? Okay, all right looks good, so we're looking for a second. Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Thank you. Lynn, please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:26:12] Okay, thank you Chair. So this motion adopts as FPA what was the Preliminary Preferred Alternative for 46 of 47 species analyzed in Attachment 1. Harlequin rockfish is the exception and will be covered in a later motion. The top table contains species which we have already defined and adopts the PPA as the FPA maintaining those 18 species in the FMP based on our previous analysis. The second table has those remaining species, again, other than harlequin, which the PPA was to maintain in the FMP. All of these species have annual catches in federal waters greater than the 25% threshold that we had previously adopted, indicating that they are in the fishery and in need of conservation and management. Again, all of the species adopt PPA as FPA of a single coast stock wide with the exception of three species, cowcod, California scorpionfish, not rockfish, and starry rockfish are defined as California only. All of these species have either unknown or homogenous population structure as was shown in the literature review. While there is some genetic evidence of population structure for cowcod, It has been managed as one stock, and that stock has been rebuilding ahead of schedule, or has rebuilt well ahead of schedule, which would indicate that the current management regime is beneficial to the stock productivity. We did have some consideration for splitting bocaccio rockfish north and south of 40°10' as there is a geographic break there at Cape Mendocino. There is also a bit of a difference between fishery management targeting north and south, with south targeting and north being more bycatch. And the most recent stock assessment was Category 1 for south and Category 3 for the north. However, The GMT does recommend defining bocaccio as one stock coastwide going forward, which provides the greatest flexibility for management and future assessments. This does not preclude assessments from being done with the split at the 40°10'. And finally, the GAP requested that rosethorn and stripetail rockfish be examined using the 10-factor analysis to provide some more information on managing those species in the FMP and defining them, or whether we should consider moving them to be EC species or removing from the FMP completely. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:02] Okay, thank you Lynn. Questions for the motion maker? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:29:07] Thanks Chair. Thanks Lynn. My question is, is this, does this comply with the Tribal Report under this agenda item in terms of, are these species and the designations matching up what was in that report?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:20] Lynn

**Lynn Mattes** [00:29:24] Through the Chair, Miss Ridings, the Tribal Report spoke more to the nearshore species which will be covered in a subsequent motion. I do not believe any of these species or designations were specified in the Tribal Report to the best of my knowledge.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:41] Thank you Corey. Thank you Lynn. All right, so with that a little discussion on the motion? All right, not seeing....oh, Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:29:53] Thank you Mr. Vice....or Mr. Chair, sorry about that. Thank you Lynn for the motion. I just wanted to touch quickly on I think what is probably the most interesting change here relative to cowcod rockfish. And I think I'm going to relate this back to the SSC Report and the recommendation to split that stock into, I believe it was at Conception, and I think that I'm supportive of how it's listed here in the motion because I think back to the question that I asked yesterday, despite cowcod having two different assessment models that are different categories, CDF&W took it very much to heart that despite the stock definition, that the assessment model areas are indicative of that particular area and the output, regardless of the combination of an OFL or a harvest limit, those models are very informative of how to avoid localized depletion and that management measures are to be taken in those respective areas as appropriate. And that is how we proceeded with copper rockfish and how we intend to continue proceeding for species that fall into this category like cowcod. So thank you Lynn for the motion. I'll be supporting it. I think that we've had a comprehensive discussion about these particular set of species and feeling relatively good about where they're going to land. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:25] Thank you Caroline. Anyone else? I don't see any hands. I'm going to call for the motion. Okay, I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:31:37] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:39] Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, the motion passes unanimously. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:00] Thanks Mr. Chair. I realized we kind of moved into making some motions, but I probably should have raised my hand earlier. But I just had a few sort of thoughts on this as it percolated overnight and thinking about this. I just wanted to put out there that I think that this is a tremendous amount of things and information that we are considering in a single agenda item. There are so many decisions to be made here. There is incredibly rich, there is so much data, there is much information that we should have to make these decisions. And I do not think that we had adequate time and adequate analysis to do this up to the standard that the Council typically does. The GMT noted the time limitations in their analysis in their report. The GAP noted time limitations actually across several of their reports, and the SSC noted this as well. So I wanted to put that out there that I feel that given this is a major action, I think it needs more analysis and time and it needs more consideration by our ABs and MTs. Transparency is so important in what we do and I'm not seeing our typical level being applied here. The analysis done by staff, I want to be extremely clear, that I really appreciate the work that you put into that given the time that you have and what you did. So this is very deeply appreciative of that. Also noting that it, again, I think is insufficient to match the scope of the action being considered here. I'm going to plot a couple of examples. So the....as was noted yesterday, they were only able to talk to 9 to 10 fishermen and then the GAP to consider moving fish out of management, a large number of species out of management. And on the face of that I think that is insufficient analysis. There was no formal methodology followed as was noted. That simply was not possible given the time and the amount of resources that staff had there. The binning of species in the analysis was not supported by the SSC. The SSC noted that there needs to be species-specific analysis. I note that the GMT did a really Herculean effort to try to do that, but again, that lack of time created an analysis that I do not think is sufficient on a species by species basis. And also, it was noted in the presentation that factor 10 was not considered in the analysis at all, and I think that is a very important piece of

the factor analysis, because we have good evidence that the level of management in supporting science that will come from the states will not exist. I don't feel that we have full documentation to say that with full confidence, but what we have now in front of us and what we are hearing from advisors and folks is that that level of management will not occur. I also wanted to just recognize in general, and this is something that I think I and probably the Council enterprise as a whole has taken for granted, which has been the coordination between the feds, the states, and the tribes that happens under this FMP. In my mind the MSA provides clear latitude to do what you're doing now. And I'm really struggling with sort of, again, getting back to why we're doing this and why now? And we're hearing multiple pieces of evidence and the statements from NMFS that might lead us, and I think Miss Mattes spoke to this earlier, just because NMFS doesn't want to manage some species anymore is asking us to consider removing them from the FMP doesn't mean that the Council has to agree with that. I just want to be really clear that according to the law it is absolutely possible to continue to manage these stocks in an FMP. I have sort of one more concern, and that is regarding sort of the entire suite of things that we're considering, especially relating to the possibility of removing stocks and species from the FMP, which is the purpose and need of this action which we articulated, I think Keeley said earlier, maybe it was two years ago, and that is thinking about for assessing overfished status and determining if overfishing is occurring is the core of the purpose and need, and yet if we know moving these to state management there's a very good chance that that won't happen under state management, that we don't have evidence or analysis that that's going to occur. In front of us I don't think we can make that decision, and I think that does not fit the purpose and need. So I just wanted to share some of those thoughts as we're discussing these things here, have that out in the open. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:05] Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:05:05] Thank you. Thank you for those comments Corey. I'll try to walk through a couple of the items that you noted. One, I'll say, you know in this process, you now, I feel like I have to say this, that in general what I often hear is that for actions that people do not want to happen they feel like it's moving too fast, and for actions that they want to happen it's move too slow. I hear that across the board. We have been working on this for three years. We have spent a lot of time on this action and we are not at final action for this entire action. We have another chance to look at it in September. And what we've asked for is what more do you need to have that discussion and to get to that point, right? So that we're not at the end of this so I will note that. I do think, right, going through the analysis, while there was an opportunity to bin things, it is a species by species evaluation. So when you look through those bins and what they have, where there is something unique to a particular species that is called out in every single factor. Some of these species are very similar. There is not independent information across those species. What we did not want to have to do was to have an even longer document that doesn't tell you more, right? And I think that's really important in our process to say we're always looking at how can we have that information for the Council that tells you something and the public that tells you something specific to act upon rather than even more pages of documents when it's not efficient. I think in general too as we go through this process we've had a lot of good dialogue, and you're right there's this history that looks like we have been outside of our jurisdiction and that cannot continue. We cannot have a system where it looks like we are acting outside of what the law allows us to do, which is to act in the EEZ. There is a very limited ability for NMFS to ever reach into state waters. It's preemption, it is a very high bar, right? And so that process is not something that we're looking



at, and so it is, it's a very hard question for these species, and there's so many things at play, right? So the nearshore species are different from some of these other species, but I think the Council really has to ask the hard question when there's only 3% of fishery activity for a species in the EEZ can this Council do something meaningful there? I don't think it can. That's a hard question. I'm not misstating that this is a difficult decision to look at, but we have to come back to the facts and what we have in the analysis. There has been a lot of good discussion but we've been working on this a long time. We've got one more chance in September. I don't see a reason to slow it down. That said, I am expecting that there will be more work between June and September, and if there is something explicit that you feel like you are missing, please ask for it. Finally, I do want to address your statement on factor 10, which was also noted in public comments, right? Factor 10 we view as more appropriately and consistently across, if you look at the way that other Councils have used these 10 factors, that's applied when NMFS is determining whether to add a species to the FMP. The way that it was written, and it's very clear in the National Standard rule that added these 10 factors is trying to avoid duplicative management where state management is adequate. We're looking at removal, right? We're looking at the reverse. We as an agency, we don't necessarily look at the adequacy of a state to manage because that's the different question than what we're asking here. So I do think what's in the analysis is appropriate, but again, if there's something explicit that you think would help you in that evaluation for September, that level of information and detail would be helpful to bring forward, right? It's difficult to have a generic I don't have enough. Please tell me the rocks that you would like us to bring. There's a lot of good effort on this and I think we can get there. And so I'm really hoping that whatever happens today, that if we have something that we can get there to September, I think can. We have an excellent team working on this and we've had really great input and I think we're on a good path.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:31] Thank you Keeley. Corey.

**Corey Ridings** [00:09:34] Thanks Chair. Thanks Keeley. I appreciate that. I totally agree there's a tendency to move fast versus slow based on how those outcomes are looking for people or who's interested or who is not, so I understand that. I think my deepest concern here is that I just see a mismatch in that speed based on at least what I perceive to be the real impacts for our fisheries that could come from this action. So that's just what I'm seeing. Also I wanted to thank you for clarifying my question on NEPA yesterday. I think that is incredibly important in terms of knowing sort of when and where that analysis is going to be applied. I am certainly not a NEPA expert. It is convention in this process. Convention? Maybe that's not the right word. Typically, we see NEPA analysis somewhat early in the process because this Council has a history of using that platform as a form of communication and sharing analysis, and that isn't here in that case. Now I heard you say yesterday, you know, that's not needed at that point and not necessarily legally obligated, but I am looking forward to seeing that and seeing that more analysis. In terms of where we are today, it is my opinion that I think that analysis that we have in front of us as of today is not sufficient and doesn't match sort of where we are at. I think that I just disagree, although maybe this will come up between now and September about the level of analysis in the species by species basis. I think there's just not enough there. I think collectively and looking at our purpose and need, it was stated that we are going to use existing, sorry, either knowledge or data or what we have today, and I appreciate that. I would like a deeper dive, and maybe that will happen in the forthcoming months, but right now and based on what we're hearing from our advisory bodies, I do not think we have enough in front of us at this point. I also, in terms of state water, federal

management, low percentages, I hear you. If there's a very low percentage that's in the EEZ then that raises questions. And I think that's a lot of what we are trying to do here today and as part of this action. It is my read of Magnuson and looking at those 10 factors and based on the history of where we're at today, that it is entirely possible to keep those species in the FMP. We have been doing so up to this point and Magnuson is almost 50 years old, recognizing that all those species have not been in the FMP for 50 years. But noting that the history that we do have there, we have a strong precedent for having that federal management regardless of that low percentage. Thanks very much for offering to sort of go gather the rocks. That's great. That's something to think about. I think, again going back to this problem of sort of timing, I'm not sure we had the adequate opportunity or our advisory bodies to help us identify what those rocks are. What are the sticking points? What do they see as most important? What does this Council see as more important? So I appreciate that offer. I'm not sure that we're in a position to actually identify those rocks as much as we would like to at this point.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:14] Thank you Corey. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:13:18] Thank you Chair. I just want to ask a clarifying question. Miss Kent, with regard to factor 10, I think I heard you say that this is treated differently when considering adding versus removing a stock. Could you clarify that please?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:37] Keeley

**Keeley Kent** [00:13:40] Thanks for the question. Yeah, so if you look through the rulemaking that revised National Standard 1, there is a discussion of the different factors as well as there's a very helpful, publicly available NMFS response to CCC questions and it's very focused on this question of a need of conservation and management in the EEZ. Factor 10 is noted in the rule as being developed to look at and to be really integral when you're looking at adding a species in the FMP, because it comes back to National Standard 7?, getting that number wrong, and not creating unnecessary duplication, right? So that's the intent, right, if a state is already managing a species out in the EEZ, which a state can do when it's not in an FMP, taking a hard look at, is this a scenario where federal management is really needed or are you going to create this duplication of state management that is already getting us there, right? So that's the intent of that factor. So it really is a different test looking at adding a species than removing it.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:14:46] I mean the reason I ask is because reading from the regulation, "When considering removing a stock from an FMP, Council should prepare a thorough analysis of factors 1 through 10". So I appreciate that maybe in practice factor 10 maybe looked a little bit differently, but I don't know if we're governed by these regulations whether we have the latitude to diminish the significance of factor 10 or, you know, anyway I just, that's why I didn't understand that because the language is pretty clear.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:15:35] Thank you Marc. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:15:35] And I'd like to return, I thank Keeley for that answer earlier about that we need to look at these factors 1 through 10. The....whether a stock is predominantly caught in the EEZ is actually not one of the 10 factors. The 10 factors appear after that and predominantly

or principally also do not appear in the 10 factors. What the guidance in the regulation says that it should be a significant contributing factor, but it's not determinative. And my concern is that the analysis on these wobbler species, we're importing something that's not part of the 10 factors into the analysis and that gives me some pause.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:44] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:16:44] Thank you. It wasn't a question, but I will respond. In looking at sort of how we think about our jurisdiction as laid out clearly in the MSA and separate from the ten factors, really the part where in the 10 factors we see that coming in most clearly is both under factors 2 and 3. So the fishery that we are looking at is the fishery that occurs in the EEZ. So that's one piece where our jurisdiction comes in, where we are seeing that as a function of how that factor is applied. And then in factor three, where you were looking at whether or not the FMP can do anything. As this Council well knows, the FMP and the regulations that implement it are only in effect in the EEZ. They do not exist in federal waters. We have not preempted the state. That is a very different test, right? And so when you look at whether or not an FMP can have an influence on the stock, that is another lens through which you're looking at the limitation we have on the EEZ and then where the fishing for the stock occurs. So I do think there's sort of a difference in whether or not it's explicitly stated versus how the factors are set up, and hopefully that's clear as you look through the analysis of how that is applied.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:18:06] Thank you Keeley. Butch Smith.

**Butch Smith** [00:18:09] Thank you Mr. Chair. I wouldn't get in the middle of this with a bulletproof vest and a pocket full of hand grenades, but you know an observation that just struck me that tells me here's your sign. You know we just went through a seven year gear switching exercise and now we're going through year three on this issue. Maybe the whole groundfish process ought to be looked at because that's a, anybody think that's light speed is sadly mistaken with all the hard work and effort and everything that goes into. And I just....observation statement, but this is part of the issue that we have with the fishing communities that, you know, groundfish and all is hugely slow and cumbersome, probably for a reason that I do not know but I'm working on that, but boy oh boy it's something that we probably need to step back and look at every once in a while to see what we're doing on if we can improve that time and effort that goes into this. Just an observation. Didn't mean to slow the conversation down, but that's certainly three years doesn't seem like, that would be five lifetimes in the salmon world. So anyway, there'd be people retiring. So anyway, I just don't want to make light of the issue but that's a.....we've had some pretty long issues in this in this groundfish stuff that takes a lot of years you know. Anyway, thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:57] Thank you Butch. Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:19:57] Thank you Chair. I just want to.....I don't feel like I want to get into the next motion without saying this. I heard it come up yesterday and then again this morning about state management of stocks, and that's what we'll be discussing next. And I think it's really important to note that WDFW has in statute our fish and wildlife mandate, and to preserve and protect resources for our stakeholders, we take that very seriously at WDFW. Conservation is of utmost importance to the way we manage our fishery. It's something we talk about with the four

Coastal Treaty Tribes in every species that we manage. So I just want to be sure that's clear that people know that if a stock was managed by the state it wouldn't have the MSA obviously, but state management, we take that very seriously and at WDFW, and I just wanted to make that clear. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:21:16] Thank you Heather. That's a good thought for us to go to a break maybe. Let's come back at say 9:35. Sound good? So we'll do that.....(BREAK).

**Lynn Mattes** [00:21:34] Thank you to the tower of power for helping me fix some minor things on some of the motions I'd sent them earlier during the break, so it was a good time to break. Excuse me. I move the Council adopt as Preliminary Preferred Alternative, PPA, That the below stocks are in need of conservation and management and should remain in the FMP based on the 10-factor analysis in Attachment 2, with stock definition options in the table below. Black rockfish off of Oregon and Washington, 2 stocks, state-specific. Blue and deacon rockfish off of Oregon and in Washington, 2 stocks, state-specific. Cabazon off of Washington only. Copper rockfish, Oregon and Washington, 1 stock, a combined Washington and Oregon stock. Kelp greenling off of Washington, 1 stock, Washington only. And quillback rockfish off of Oregon and Washington, state-specific.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:43] Okay, is the language on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:22:45] Yes sir it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:48] Okay, looking for a second? Question? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:22:51] Just flagging a little copy/edit here, option 1 or option 11?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:22:58] Option 1 and that should be on to the next line, there we go, 1 stock. Good catch.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:05] Very good. Okay, looking for a second. Second by Heather Hall. Thank you Heather. Please speak to your motion Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:23:11] Thank you Chair. So this motion does adopt as a PPA keeping 10 stocks of nearshore species in the FMP off of Washington and Oregon. While these stocks do not meet the 25% catch in the EEZ threshold, these stocks are the primary target species in the recreational fisheries that are not limited to state or federal waters and can occur in either. Most effort in the recreational fishery since 2004 has been in state waters due to depth restrictions in Rockfish Conservation Areas as yelloweye and canary rockfish have been rebuilding. Until the last couple of years anglers were not allowed to fish at all depths for most or all of the year. Therefore, the lack of harvest from the EEZ may be more a product of regulations than actual catch location and may not accurately reflect where the biomass is. As yelloweye rockfish rebuilds, additional depths and times are likely to continue to open to the fishery participants. The economic importance of these species within directed groundfish fisheries indicates that conservation and management is needed and could improve the condition of the stock. Additionally, excuse me, the PSA analysis in Cope et al, which I am one of the et al, as is I believe Mr. Niles, showed that some of the

nearshore rock species were some of most vulnerable with quillback rockfish in particular topping that list. Black rockfish are the backbone of the Washington and Oregon recreational fisheries as well as the Oregon commercial nearshore fishery. This stock is economically and culturally important to those fisheries and our coastal fishing communities. As black rockfish goes, so goes the bottom fishery fish fishery, as it tends to be the primary driver of bag limits and some other regulations. Bottom fish fishing has become the stable and dependable fishery as other key fisheries such as salmon and tuna tend to be more volatile and variable year to year and month to month. Blue and deacon rockfish are regularly caught with black rockfish, as they can form some mixed schools. Both of these are semi-pelagic schooling species. ODFW research has shown that blue and deacon rockfish can occur farther offshore than other nearshore rockfish. And regulations, as mentioned above or previously, could be the reason for the low harvest within the EEZ. Copper and quillback rockfish, while more demersal species, are also tend to be caught on the same trips as black, blue, and deacon rockfish. While they aren't necessarily a target, they are a welcome splash of color in the bag. It is anticipated that further discussions will happen between today, our PPA decision, and the FPA choice later in the year about keeping within the FMP, but possibly delegating management authority to the states. The intent is this could function similarly to what has effectively been happening. In regards to kelp greenling and cabezon off of Washington being kept in the FMP, this was based on the Tribal Report, as they were highlighted as a couple of species that were important to the tribes off of Northwest Washington and could benefit from some additional discussion. We do anticipate that, or I do anticipate, that keeping them in the FMP for now, removing or making EC species, and how that interplay occurs could happen between now and the FPA. And those are the key points I wanted to make. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:06] Okay, thank you Lynn. Questions for the motion maker? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:27:15] Thanks Chair. Thanks Lynn. I'm just going to quickly ask the same question. Is this responsive to the Tribal Report?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:27:24] Through the Chair, Miss Ridings, yes it is. The Tribal Report specifically called out kelp greenling and cabezon, which is why we recommend the motion has them remaining in the FMP for now so that some additional discussions based on the Tribal Report can happen.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:42] All right, thank you Corey. All right, I'll open the floor for discussion. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:27:48] Thank you Chair, and thank you Lynn for the motion. I thought that your justification for the motion is sound, but it does illustrate the difficulty with the question I asked the GMT yesterday about why certain of these stocks were recommended to remain in the FMP. For example, blue rockfish in Oregon, 2.7% in the EZZ, 7.3 in Washington. And deacon rockfish 3.5% in Oregon and zero in Washington in the EEZ. But I understand that these are mixed stock fisheries and that there's been a lack of access, and you know reflecting on my question to the GMT, I don't understand why that same analysis doesn't apply to other stocks, namely those south of the Oregon/California border. So I appreciate your analysis and I hope that whomever offers a motion for California stocks remembered all of that. But I do have one question though.

The Council adopted a 25% threshold, presumably incorporating a buffer for management restrictions. So can you explain perhaps why you don't think that that was an adequate buffer?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:45] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:29:45] Thank you Chair Pettinger and Mr. Gorelnik. It could be an adequate buffer but would like some additional look and discussion. Again, we've got 21 years, the entire history of the GEM Report of our recreational fisheries being restricted to mostly inside of 40 fathoms, which off of Oregon roughly approximates the state waters line. We had several years where we were restricted inside of the 30 fathom line, and even time periods inside of 20 fathoms. Additionally, some of the ODFW coastwide, the recent coastwide rockfish assessment and some other work done by ODFW researchers has showed that there's a large population of blue and deacon rockfish that live farther offshore than our recreational anglers have had access to. That was the primary reason, and the mixed stock fishery to keep the discussion going. Was not ready to make a full decision at this point on removing and hoping we could have some additional discussion between now and September on that.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:30:53] Thank you very much.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:55] All right, thank you Lynn, Marc. Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:31:00] Thank you. Thank you for the motion Lynn. Just a couple of quick comments. I'm wondering if we could scroll up just a little bit on the motion to the text above the table. I am not reading into this in terms of the intent, but just noting that in the text of the motion it says, "in need of conservation and management", right? And the framing that we're looking at is in need of conservation and management in the EEZ. I appreciate and hear the remarks that you've made Lynn. And I'll just note on my part, right, as you've said, I want to look more at this between PPA and FPA and bring that rationale that you've provided today as well as the additional information in the reports into the analysis and ensure that we are looking at these species in the 10-factor analysis consistently. So I will be abstaining but I recognize the good work that you put into this and it's just so that we have that opportunity to take that final look between now and September when we make that final action. So thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:31:59] Thank you Keeley. Heather.

**Heather Hall** [00:00:00] Thank you Chair Pettinger, and thank you for the motion Miss Mattes, and for your rationale. I have some points to add to that too. And relative to the idea of using catch as one of the proxies that was considered in addition to the other 10 factors, I just want to note that I think in this case it's the GMT did a good job of considering the fishery. Washington does not have a nearshore commercial fishery. Commercial fishing is prohibited in state waters in Washington. We have used federal science and policies to manage in-state waters consistently and in coordination with NMFS. Black rockfish is principally caught in the EEZ and is economically important in the Washington recreational and the tribal fishery. Blue and deacon rockfish do not meet that 25% threshold, but they are caught incidentally with black rockfish, and it would be difficult to manage them separately in this mixed stock approach here. And I would note that copper, quillback, and quillback in Washington do meet the factors 1 and 5 through 7 as noted in

the GMT Report because.....and more than 25% of the catch does occur in the EEZ in Washington. This important economic importance I think is highlighted again in the GMT's rationale. And I also wanted to just reiterate that for copper and quillback, these stocks are not only important components of the Washington recreational fishery, but also to the four Coastal Treaty Tribes as noted in the Tribal Report. I do support this motion for these stocks and are committed to working with the four Coastal Treaty Tribes prior to September for further discussion. And then I also did want to refer to the PSA analysis in Attachment 2 which shows that China, copper, and quillback have the highest vulnerability scores. These 3 species are in the major concern category where principal mortality off Washington is attributed to the EEZ, I think with the exception of China rockfish there. And while the PSA didn't account for the principal area of mortality, It could be considered in determining whether a species is vulnerable to the fishery in federal waters and in need of conservation and management in the EEZ. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:06] All right, thank you Heather. All right, anyone else? Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:03:08] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Lynn for this part of the motion. I want to I guess start with saying I support the motion for the reasons provided and I want to touch on one of Lynn's comment about seeking some more information about delegation in the context of this being a PPA. So a little bit of a spoiler alert, I think Marc, to your question or concern coming up. This is an approach. This is an approach they're taking for a PPA to leave them in and seek delegation. And I think what we're going to see here reflective in the next discussion is just a different approach with the same idea just coming at it from a different perspective. But as this laid out here, I'm comfortable with supporting it as a PPA. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:50] Thank you Caroline. All right, I don't see anymore hands. And with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:04:01] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:02] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Keeley Kent** [00:04:05] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:06] All right, the motion passes with one abstention. Thank you very much. Thank you Lynn. Okay, Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:04:17] Thank you Chair. You're going to get tired of hearing me this morning. I'm ready with Motion number 3 out of 5 for this item that I have, okay?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:26] All right.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:04:27] Actually, Miss McKnight is trying to frantically wave down....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:32] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:04:32] As has been happening a lot, I believe Caroline and myself have been confused. I have recently come to find out this is a thing that happens.....(laughter)...

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

**Lynn Mattes** [00:04:48] Thank you Vice-Chair. Sorry, it's going to take a minute to get my train of thought going again. It got slightly derailed. I'm glad we've figured out who's Caroline and who's Keeley. So I do have a third of five motions. And again, I know there's a lot of motions here, but I was trying to break things down into small, manageable pieces because there is a lot. So if Hayden or Kris is ready. Thank you. I move the Council adopt as PPA Alternative 2, identifying the following species as not in need of conservation and management in the EEZ based on the 10-factor analysis in Attachment 2, and therefore should be removed from the Groundfish Fishery Management Plan. From the shallow nearshore bin: Black rockfish off of California. Blue rockfish, California. Black and yellow rockfish. China rockfish. Gopher rockfish. Grass rockfish. Kelp rockfish. Cabezon off of Oregon and California. And kelp greenling off of Oregon and California. From the deeper nearshore bin: Brown rockfish. Copper rockfish off of California. Olive rockfish. Quillback off of California. And treefish. From the shallow shelf bin: Calico rockfish. Freckled. Halfbanded. Pygmy. Swordspine. And honeycomb rockfish. From the deep shelf bin: Chameleon. Harlequin. Pink. And pinkrose rockfish. The no-mortality bin: Light dusky rockfish. Dwarf-red rockfish. And from the leopard shark bin: Surprise, leopard shark.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:52] Okay Lynn, is the language on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:06:55] I believe so sir.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:06:57] Okay. Looking for a second. Seconded by Heather Hall. Thank you Heather. And again Lynn, please speak to this motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:11] Thank you Chair. Felt I was left hanging there for a moment. So this motion does remove a number of species from the FMP as the PPA, and this is based on the 10-factor analysis and also looked at the SSC and the GMT Reports. And by removing them under Alternative 2 we're moving....this removing them from the FMP means they are not in need of conservation and management. Table 2 in the GMT Report 2 lays out very good rationale for each of these species. They covered it very well yesterday. I don't know that I need to repeat all of that. And I do note this is where harlequin rockfish got picked up. Based on some information between March and June, Council staff and the analytical team realized we needed to take a look at harlequin via the 10-factor analysis, and based on that harlequin got moved from Motion 1 to Motion 3. Many of these species have de minimis harvest and are not generally targeted in fisheries. Light dusky rockfish and dwarf-red rockfish have had no mortality in the last 21 years off the U.S. West Coast. We are likely not in the range of those species. And Mr. DeVore and I have been trying to get these removed from the FMP for over a decade. While there is some targeting and limited catch of leopard shark, it occurs almost exclusively in bays and estuaries which are outside of the EEZ, therefore they are not within this fishery. And thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:55] Okay, thank you Lynn. All right, questions on the motion maker? Marc Gorelnik.



**Marc Gorelnik** [00:09:03] Thank you. And thank you Lynn for the motion. In view of your justification of certain stocks in your previous motion, could you explain why you're including quillback California, copper California, and brown rockfish in this motion?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:22] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:09:23] Chair Pettinger, Mr. Gorelnik, this goes a little bit to the answer Miss McKnight had previously. It's slightly different approaches to how we move forward. I don't want to put Miss McKnight on the spot, but it was somewhat strategic in how the individual states are looking at moving forward. And I will defer to Miss McKnight if that's all right with the Chair and with Miss McKnight?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:55] Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:09:55] Thank you. Yes, to add to the question and some additional context. I suspected that the shallow and deeper nearshore were going to generate some more discussion here. But I think first, looking at the clear line that is set for whether or not these fisheries operate exclusively in the EEZ versus state waters are very clear for some of them, and the others, I think are subject to some discussion. I think that the difference between Oregon and Washington versus California is, you know, 1,100 miles of coastline dictates a lot of variability for some of these species and five different recreational management areas that have a variety of differing RCA boundaries lend to a different lens. I don't think it's a foregone conclusion that because these are being proposed for removal that that means that will be what the FPA is. I think this is an opportunity to get additional information in public comment. I certainly expect to be providing some guidance to Council staff about delegation or other information that could come forward. In between now and final action I would certainly welcome other pieces of information, the rocks that we were talking about earlier that might be welcomed to inform this decision. I'd also like to just echo beyond that, similar to what Miss Hall mentioned earlier, is that the state of California does have a Nearshore Fishery Management Plan. We do have a comprehensive set of regulations for the recreational fishery in place in state regulations. And we do have limited access permit for both shallow and nearshore in the commercial sectors. So there should be no perception that these two bins are going to be left stranded or without a management framework to rely upon and depend upon. There certainly might be some tradeoffs and some other things that need some more thought, and that's what we have right now is some time to do that, if that helps.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:01] Thank you Caroline. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:12:01] Thank you very much. Thank you again for this proposal. I'm just curious about sharks. There are sharks in the HMS FMP. Are there other sharks that are now in the groundfish FMP? Should the leopard shark be incorporated eventually? I guess that's a question for later, but just curious, are there are other sharks now on this list? I confess that I haven't read the whole list. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:27] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:12:27] Chair Pettinger, Dr. Lent, yes, Pacific spiny dogfish is in the groundfish FMP. More of the more pelagic and migratory sharks tend to be in the HMS FMP. And I'm trying my best right now to not get confused with what's in Oregon state regulations as considered as part of the general marine bag limit versus the HMS limit, but there are other sharks, but that other shark has a very different life history characteristic.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:55] Okay, thank you Rebecca and Lynn. Okay. All right, Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:13:03] Thanks Chair. Thanks Lynn for this motion and the discussion. I will not be voting for this notion. I think the consideration of moving these species out of federal management is just not ready for PPA at this time. We don't have enough analysis or the time to look at this. I just don't think it matches the scope and depth of the action being considered, which is major. I want to reiterate that this is not a reflection of the quality of the work provided, but of the scope of the work provided and the time that we've had for consideration by the Councils, by the ABs, by the management teams, and by the public.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:13:47] Thank you Corey. All right, further discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:13:52] I'd like to offer an amendment to the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:01] Okay.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:14:01] And the amendment would delete quillback California from the deeper shore list, deeper nearshore list. It's not shelf, it's deep nearshore. I believe it's on the deep nearshore.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:48] Okay.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:14:48] And it would be, yeah, it's quillback California just because that's how it's stated above.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:57] All right. Is the language of the screen accurate Marc?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:14:58] It is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:59] All right, looking for a second. Seconded by Corey Ridings. Thank you. Please speak to your.....

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:15:07] Yeah, thank you. As has been pointed out this is PPA, not FPA, but I still think there's a burden, so to speak, to include a stock within the PPA. This stock, amongst others, seems to be treated differently in California than other stocks are treated in other states and there was no answer from the GMT as to why that was so. I thought that Lynn Mattes's motion, prior motion was quite clear and quite justified as to why certain stocks are included even if they don't reach the 25% threshold, and that included stocks that had low single digits in the EEZ. Quillback California, and I could have included copper, but I'm just going to include quillback at this stage, is over 20%. It approaches that and it just is illogical to me why that stock would be

deleted from the FMP and other stocks would be retained when the justification for those other stocks applies with even greater force to quillback. Most of the quillback habitat in California is the Farallons north. We have taken steps to conserve quillback through the rebuilding plan. We're prohibiting take between 20 fathoms, rather 20, yeah, 20 fathoms and 50 fathoms. And if you look at where the three mile line is as you go north from San Francisco, a majority of that quillback area is outside state waters. And as we go to all-depth fisheries, which is what we're hoping to do in the near future, all of that's going to be opened up. So I think that at least for purposes of the PPA there is an adequate justification to remove quillback in California. I also want to return to a point, to a discussion I had earlier on the floor here about whether we use the predominant or principle. That language appears in the regulations apart from the 10 factors. You don't reach those 10 factors in the first instance unless you've decided that a stock is not predominantly caught or principally caught. And I have to assume that the wise humans that drafted that regulation chose their words carefully and they did not repeat predominant or principal in those 10 factors, they used other words. And so I would much, I would prefer that that analysis hew more carefully to the words in the regulation and we not offer dispositive weight to whether stock is predominantly caught into the 10 factors where that language is not included. But if we were to do that then we'd have to do it for all of the stocks we're discussing, including those in the prior motion that are being retained in the FMP. So my purpose of my amendment here is to retain, at least for purposes of the PPA, the argument that this isn't final applies both ways, and I would prefer at this point that I don't think there's adequate justification to remove quillback California from the FMP, to be revisited upon further analysis.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:17] Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:19:17] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Marc for the amendment here. Just a point of clarification, the amendment says to delete quillback rockfish California from the deeper nearshore bin. Do you have another home for it somewhere else? Thank you.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:19:34] Well that's an excellent question Miss McKnight. And I think that if we're not removing it then we're retaining it. And so what I would do, I would plagiarize Miss Mattes's prior motion and insert in a new motion quillback California.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:00] After we did this one or?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:20:03] It would have to be a further motion, yes. If we're deleting it here it has to have a home, so.....

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:10] That's right. That's true.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:20:11] I think it's too complicated for me at this stage to do that. I think is easier to do it in a separate motion. And I'll rely upon Council staff to help me with that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:21] Okay, well in that period, you know quillback are fairly hardy fish so we'll try to find him a home as soon as possible, successful here. So, Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:20:33] Thank you Mr. Chair. Are we still on questions or are we on discussion?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:20:38] We're going into discussion now if you want.

**Keeley Kent** [00:20:43] Okay, thank you. Thank you Marc for this amendment for the Council to consider. Similar to my remarks on Miss Mattes's motion, I think I'd want to understand more sort of how that rationale fit through the 10 factors. So at this point I would abstain on this. I hear the points that you raised, but it's not enough for me to feel certain on how that outcome would look. But because I think, as you noted, your rationale is continuing to hark back to sort of how you are viewing the 10 factors and the relationship with predominantly. It is short, but I will read it from the NS 1 rule I think there's a very helpful guidance, and that, the National Standard 1 revision rule states, "That if a stock is not predominantly", in parentheses, ("i.e. mainly or the most part) caught in federal waters, a Council may lack the authority and thus ability to adopt measures that would prevent overfishing and rebuild overfished stocks. It would not make sense in that case to require a Council to automatically include the stock in an FMP". So I think right there there are these provisions. Perhaps it's not as clear as you would like it to be but I do see the connection point there and want to come back to that. But as I noted, really for the main reason that I abstained prior, I would abstain from this amendment wanting to understand how your rationale that you listed really played into a further analysis if that was the direction the Council chose.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:12] Thank you Keeley. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:22:12] Thank you for that Keeley. And I don't dispute the language of the statute. It says what it says. The regulations we're operating under here presumably are the regulations enacted to implement that statute and that's where we are. So, I mean I appreciate, I certainly agree it shouldn't automatically be included, but I mean here it's a policy call and that's our job here.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:22:43] Okay, thank you Marc. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:22:43] Thanks Chair. I actually have a question for the maker of the amendment, which is, Marc you talked earlier about California quill, California copper, and brown. And then you mentioned very briefly, this is just one little amendment. But I'm curious if you wanted to elaborate a little bit on why this is quill and not copper and brown as well?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:23:05] Thank you for the question. Through the Chair, it was simply a numerical issue. The quillback is over 20%. The others are high but are below 20%. I also felt it was better to take a smaller bite than a big bite.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:25] Okay, further discussion? Caroline.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:23:25] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think that in the grand scheme here I think that I'm supportive of this amendment for the purposes of PPA and continuing the discussion. I do just want to follow up with a comment relative to your state waters line versus RC boundaries. And I just want make it clear that in the process of the state of California generating a 20-fathom boundary line for the purposes of restricting quillback, that line often went back and forth between state and federal, and so we chose to draw the line at that state/federal boundary to approximate it.

So it isn't entirely clear when you look at that map, you know, where that line is in terms of because we modified it a bit to make it clean on the regulation side. And the other is to note that quillback has never been a high target fishery across our fishery and so that lends itself, I think, to skewing the information a little bit differently as well. So I just wanted to point those two things out. But supportive of this amendment for the purposes of PPA, noting that there's more to come to place it elsewhere. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:53] Okay, Further discussion? Okay, I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:24:59] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:59] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Keeley Kent** [00:25:05] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:05] Thank you. All right, the motion passes with one abstention so. All right, so now we have an amended motion on the floor and that quillback hopefully will not die. It's not in a bin. So I'm not sure. So all right, with that, further discussion on the amended motion? I'm seeing any, so I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:25:33] Aye.

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

**Corey Ridings** [00:25:38] No.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:38] Abstentions?

**Keeley Kent** [00:25:38] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:39] Okay, so we have.....the motion passes with one no and one abstention, so very good. All right, moving along. Marc, were you going to find some place for that quillback? Or do you want to wait for that?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:25:57] Well I think that there's a question as to whether it's necessary. I don't know if Executive Director Burden has a comment on that.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:08] Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:26:10] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I would propose we work through the five motions that Miss Mattes has said she has. We're still kind of cogitating on this. There might not be a motion that's needed but we're still doing some cogitation. So let's just proceed with Miss Mattes's motions and then come back to this if that's okay?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:26:35] All right, thank you. With that, Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:26:35] Thank you Chair Pettinger. And I figured I could go with my next one anyway to give Mr. Gorelnik time to pencil out anything he needed to if he needed to. So if the fine gentlemen in the back of the room could put up ODFW Motion 4. I move the Council adopt as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative, PPA, Alternative 3, identifying the below species as not in need of conservation and management in the EEZ but should remain in the FMP designated as EC species based on the 10-factor analysis in Agenda Item E.6, Supplemental Attachment 2. And this for rockfish species: Brownspotted. Flag. Greenblotched. Rosy. Speckled. Tiger. And Mexican rockfishes. And then flatfish species: Butter. Curlfin. Rock. And sand sole. And starry flounder.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:44] All right, thank you Lynn. Is the language on the screen accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:27:47] Yes sir it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:27:48] Okay, looking for a second? Seconded by Heather Hall. Thank you Heather. All right, please speak to this motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:27:56] Thank you sir. So this motion does move 7 rockfish species and all 5 of the other flatfish species to Ecosystem Component, or EC species. While these species may not be in need of conservation and management, they do seem to be, do seem...should remain in the FMP as EC species. These species are principally caught in the EEZ. Brownspotted rockfish currently does have management measures applied which are intended to improve the health of the stock. Current low mortality is likely due to a prohibition on retention, and the GMT recommended that this species could benefit from continued monitoring. For flag rockfish, again, they are principally caught in the EEZ, and while they are not necessarily a target, which is indicated by the low mortality, there is a high opportunistic value that leads to retention by recreational anglers. This is to some color to fill out the bag. Similarly, the GMT did recommend continued monitoring on this one. For greenblotched rockfish, the range may be primarily off of Mexico, but with the recent reopening of the Cowcod Conservation Areas off of Southern California, there is some potential for a new fishery to develop. We did see a spike in catches in 2023 suggesting it's important to some user groups. And the GMT recommended continuing monitoring of this species. Rosy rockfish, also low mortality but is caught in the EEZ, and it can sometimes be confused with rosethorn rockfish. It is again not a primary target but can be caught occasionally and similarly the GMT recommended keeping as.....keep continuing monitoring. Same thing for speckled rockfish caught in the EEZ, low mortality but high opportunistic value and GMT recommended continuing monitoring. Tiger rockfish, this species is sometime caught in the rec fishery and has some value in the commercial live fish fishery. And again, the opportunistic values can lead to retention when encountered. And the GMT again suggested monitoring of this one. I forgot to put Mexican rockfish in my talking points that I have penciled out, but similar to the other species in this list they do occur occasionally. When I was on a fishing trip out of San Diego last year, there was a talk about an influx of Mexican rockfish, so there is some potential for them to be part of the recreational fishery, therefore they could probably benefit from some monitoring. To the flatfish species. These species are principally caught within the EEZ where there has been historic fishery but there currently is not one. They are currently not targeted. Some are landed as bycatch or incidental catch. I recently had fun helping some of our ORB Samplers identify a flatfish they had not seen before that came up in a recreational bag. There is potential to be targeted in the future

depending on markets and other external factors. And depending on the life stage, these flatfish species occupy a variety of niches within the marine ecosystem and habitat. I will try not to go too nerdy on starry flounder, but as the discussion with Dr. Heppell yesterday, they can be very far upriver. A couple of years ago, ODFW sturgeon program while sampling the Willamette River off of, in downtown Portland, caught a number of starry flounder juveniles in their nets as well. The Willamette River is 75 river miles from the ocean. They can also be caught offshore in upwards of 40 fathoms or more with other flatfish complexes. So overall, the EC designation will allow the Council to monitor mortality for any new information or if a fishery should reemerge but does not require us to actively manage. And additionally, based on the GMT Report and some previous discussions, it is anticipated that a process for regular review of impacts to EC species will be developed in the coming months. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:36] Okay, thank you Lynn. Questions for the motion maker? Okay, discussion on the motion? All right, seeing none I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:32:52] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:32:53] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Very good. Thank you. Okay, Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:33:03] Thank you Chair. Going five for five, or is it five for fighting? The hockey's going on right now. So ODFW Motion 5. I move the Council adopt language in the FMP as shown in Revised Attachment 3, requesting staff make any modifications necessary to comport to the Council's FPA.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:33] Okay, thank you. Is the language accurate?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:33:34] Yes sir it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:33:35] Second by Caroline McKnight. Thank you. All right, please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:33:41] Thank you sir. This motion just adopts the draft FMP language as shown in Attachment 3, and the intention is to allow Council staff to make any modifications to that language based on the actions we've taken in the previous and possibly subsequent motion under this agenda item in regards to how we are defining stocks. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:04] Okay, questions for the motion maker? Any discussion? All right, I'm not seeing any so I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:34:15] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:16] Opposed no? Abstentions? All right, the motion passes unanimously. Very good. Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:34:24] Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have another motion, don't worry. I mentioned it I think yesterday, but I really want to thank the GMT and the GAP for how they laid their reports out on this with their recommendations. It made it easy to follow and was easy to help devise the talking points and the rationale for these motions. I know they put a lot of hard work in, especially the GMT, and I just want that acknowledged how helpful their report and how it was laid out was in making motions. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:34:56] All right, thank you Lynn. All right. Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:35:00] I do have a motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:05] All right.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:35:05] It was sent a few minutes ago, but I could read it as well.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:16] Okay. Oh, there it is.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:35:21] I move the Council to adopt as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative that quillback rockfish California is in need of conservation and management, Alternative 1, and should remain in the FMP.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:34] Okay Marc. Is the language accurate on the screen?

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:35:37] It seems so.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:35:38] It looks like it. I just had to ask. All right, seconded by Butch Smith. All right, thank you Butch. All right, please speak to your motion.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:35:47] I don't think, I don't think there's much need. I think the discussion has taken place but I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:00] Oh, sorry Todd.

**Todd Phillips** [00:36:00] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I guess I wasn't acknowledged, but the question that I would have is that would this be for Alternative 1, Option 1, for clarity? Which would mean it'd be a single stock off of California.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:36:15] Okay, then it's already been defined as a California stock, so the language Alternative 1 is unnecessary and improper? All right, the motion has been seconded so in order to make the change I need to withdraw the motion with the permission of the second.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:36] Okay. All right.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:36:36] I don't mean to be doing Chris's job for him.

**Chris Oliver** [00:36:39] Go right ahead.....(laughter)....



**Marc Gorelnik** [00:36:40] I would like to, I would ask our scribe to delete the parenthetical Alternative 1. And I will try this again.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:36:56] Okay.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:36:56] Maybe for my last time as a Council member. And I've yet to provide a motion that I didn't screw up so that record is perfect. I move the Council to adopt as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative that quillback rockfish California is in need of conservation and management and should remain in the FMP.

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

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:37:23] It is...yes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:37:25] Okay, I'm looking for a second. Yes, seconded by Butch Smith. Very good. Okay, very good.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:37:32] And as I said before, we've already had discussion on this so I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:37:37] All right. Okay, with that I'll call for the question so. No?

**Butch Smith** [00:37:46] I would have hated to, for Marc to ruin his storied career as a Councilman leaving the quillback homeless, so I'm glad they now have a home. So I will be supporting the motion.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:37:59] Okay. Thank you Butch. Further.... Pete Hassemer. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:38:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. It's not a question for the maker of the motion, it's just, is there additional analysis or level of detail that would come back? I guess I struggled with the first piece of this that removed it thinking about that context that this is the PPA and the, all of the analysis and the reporting and everything we took, took us to this pathway of it initially was in that bin to be removed, and I heard the rationale as to why Mr. Gorelnik wanted to remove it. So I supported that with the anticipation that it was coming back here, but the question is, so because this is PPA, what additional analysis would we expect or comment that allows us to think about this one? Because it was highlighted. Why is it different here? And so what will we learn as we go forward?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:39:19] Keeley.

**Keeley Kent** [00:39:19] Thank you Vice-Chair for the question. I'll jump in on this one. I think it's a good question to ask, right? We're going through the 10-factor analysis, and similar, my remarks have been similar for Marc as they have been for Lynn, right? What we would look to do is to take the rationale that they have provided on these species and look for how do we build that out in the 10-factor analysis. On its face, right, I don't know that these motions tell us something

different to bring, but they are highlighting that Council members are seeing something different in the 10-factor analysis or something missing. So we're going to evaluate that. I don't know, I don't have a specific rock that I think we could bring back, but what we'll be looking for is how do we take all of that rationale and import it into the 10-factor analysis.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:40:04] Okay. Thank you Keeley. Marc.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:40:11] Thank you Vice-Chair, and thank you Keeley. I think as we've all said this is PPA, so all of this is subject to further analysis. And I would only ask the further analysis attempt to be more internally consistent amongst the stocks in the different states because I'm not seeing that internal consistency. I'll leave it there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:40:43] Okay, further discussion? I'm not seeing any so I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:40:52] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:40:53] Opposed no? Abstentions?

**Keeley Kent** [00:40:56] Abstain.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:40:58] And okay, the motion passes with one abstention. So thank you Marc. All right. So Todd, how are we doing here?

**Todd Phillips** [00:41:09] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. So looking at your large and long list of tasks, you have adopted FPA for 46 species, or excuse me, 45 species with two going to be considered on the 10-factor evaluation between now and FPA and one was removed. You did adopt stock definitions for those adopted under Alternative 1, and as well as revised language giving staff latitude to comport that document to reflect the decisions made here today. You have considered and discussed the 10-factor analysis and adopted a PPA as we just went through. And provided additional guidance for how we should move forward with some of this analysis in between PPA and FPA. So I would say based on my opinion you have completed the tasks at hand.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:42:06] All right, well thank you. Thank you both. Thank you everyone for a lot of hard work and wow, and especially Lynn for all the motions. We're going to take a short break.

## 7. Harvest Specifications Flexibility - Scoping

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] That wraps up the public comment and will take us to Council tasks, which are on the screen before us. Gathered a lot of information. Who wants to start the discussion here? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:22] Thanks Vice. I just want to start by saying how much I appreciate all the information that was provided under this agenda item and some of the similar agenda items across this entire week. There has been so much useful information provided, so much sharing. I find it incredibly helpful and useful for our record. I'm going to speak very briefly to a small thing in the GAP Report, which is the Problem Statement and the note of recent stock assessments for groundfish species that are not aligned with actual conditions on the water. I think I understand the intent of that, but would note that the stock assessments that we have and the quality of the folks we have working on our stock assessments and the scientific enterprise that goes into that is very top-notch. And so I don't think it's necessarily a foregone conclusion at any moment in time in a general sense that our stock assessments are not aligned with actual conditions on the water, but I do think I understand where this came from in the GAP and understanding sort of what it means to be on the the water in a fisherman's capacity and seeing things and if they do not necessarily reflect what a stock assessment says. But I wanted to be sure to just clarify that I think the problem is not necessarily that the stock assessments are false or that the quality is not high, just that there can be that mismatch when you are existing in a daily basis on the ocean from what a stock assessment is telling you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:07] Thank you. Other discussion? Marc Gorelnik.

**Marc Gorelnik** [00:02:15] Thank you. I think the overarching issue here is one of stability. It's very hard for the businesses, commercial and recreational, to have a successful enterprise when stocks seem to fluctuate so wildly, which from my perspective, although I'm not a fishery scientist, strikes me as just being an artifact of how difficult it is to catch fish. I mean our stock assessors are top notch and they do the best job they can with the data available, but we see these relatively wild swings in abundance in a given stock that intuitively doesn't seem to be real because unlike, for example salmon, where you can point to environmental factors, whether mother nature or human nature, you know obviously impact the abundance. We have a longer timeline in these wild ocean stocks. And I think that the intent of this action, I think, is to provide greater stability and to not drive things up and down so rapidly and to not build in so much precaution that we, that fisheries become very difficult if not impossible to prosecute.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:03:51] Thank you. Chair Pettinger. Rebecca Lent first, then Chair Pettinger.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:04:00] Thank you very much. Yes, I think if you look again at this Council task, and these all match the four that are on the slides, I want to first of all say this is our task in terms of what are the problems, where do we want to be, what are the outcomes, it's just in terms of harvest spex. All that other stuff about markets and quotas and things like that is not really in the spex, The harvest spex. And the other thing is, it's just by it's very nature it's a complicated fishery. You've got to juggle a lot of things, having access, the state of the resource, the fluctuations in the resource, the fluctuations in the management that is inherently kind of choppy and not as

flexible. So I think the problem is just having access to fish. Sometimes that access is difficult because you're going to catch another species and that stock assessment has not been great. And then the outcome is stability, as you said Marc, and yeah, stability, predictability, flexibility, those are the kinds of desired outcomes. We have, in terms of a range of alternatives, we have some good guidance from the GAP and the GMT, so I think people who are smarter about these things than me can probably put those out and rank them. So thank you for that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:29] Thank you. Chair Pettinger, then Butch Smith, then Lynn Mattes.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:32] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. These last few cycles the stock assessment has been kind of tough for a lot of reasons. I think I've talked about this before as far as the isolation of COVID certainly helped I think cause some issues I think. I think there was the people retiring out of the business who had relationships with stock assessment folks. And the stock assessors attended the STAR Panels were on a regular basis where that kind of ended. I think a little complacency in the fleet from engaging with the stock assessment folks. But you know stock assessment is really kind of a snapshot in time. I kind of equate it with a painting. I think the stock assessment, certainly a lot of science goes into stock assessment, but I think it's really, I think stock assessments almost as an art. I mean, and within that art field you have Rembrandts and you've got Picassos and they're all good, right? Well, it depends on what your world view is. But I think that it's best to walk amongst the trees to paint the forest. And I think that there's been a lot of good outreach that happened this last year, more so than the previous couple cycles, and that was....I think that's....we've seen some better results there. I think it's good as far as more of what the fleet sees in the water. And you know it's not like people were out there one year and seeing what's in the water. I mean people were out there, there's people that's been working on the water for 40 years. They've seen things come and go and so they have much, a really good understanding and that, and that knowledge should be embraced I would hope. I think about our former Chairman Phil Anderson, who got off the Council last year, he went out on the Iron Lady a few years ago and spent a trip with Kevin Dunn and learned so much. Stuff that he, I mean he talked to people but they don't.....if they're not digging into it you don't really get the full grasp of what's going on in the world. And so I would encourage more of that happening. I think that just the kind of the strategies that a fisherman uses, the day-to-day business and all the issues they got to deal with can greatly enrich what those results would be, I think, one way or the other, it wouldn't matter. But I think that.....but that is not necessarily the reason, I mean stock assessments are always, they're up and down, and we always have, you know, is a fisherman right or wrong? Who knows? No one knows. It's just a snap shot and it's the best estimation of what's there. But given that, there's a lot of ups and downs and these things are wildly swinging and there's no way in hell those stocks are going back and forth like that, it's just not happening. So how do you deal with that? And that's not going stop. I think you just got to engage with the scientific community as best you can and make that process better. But we need to, once we get the information, now we've got to put it into the fishery and what's the best way to do that? And I think it was, I think Rebecca, your question about the ability of the markets to absorb more fish. Well I would submit to you that the management system we have has degraded the infrastructure and the processing capacity over time and it's just getting worse. So I think you've got to turn the corner and start making things better so people will invest into the industry. Marc referred to stability, lack of stability. I think about, you know, when you're operating I say a dock, you're a processor, and you know those investments aren't cheap by any stretch of the imagination. And by the way, those facilities are going away

more and more and once they're turned into condos we're never getting them back. But who in their right mind would invest millions of dollars of their own money into a system where you can get shut down the next year? I mean, an assessment might be wrong and two years later they might say, oh, sorry. And that happens, but we can't have a system that goes up and down and up and down, it's absolutely insanity. You know we, like I'm saying, I think you've heard it on the Council floor before, you know we have rules for a reason. And the rules aren't important, it's the rationale behind that. Why are we doing that? And when it comes to overfishing we don't want to overfish to where we were 20 years ago, right? No one wants to go there. I guarantee the fleet don't want to go there. I mean if we were there where we're at 20 years ago there'd be no fishing because you couldn't afford the fuel. I would say that there's the cost of doing business. You want to catch fish. You're not....actually, you want to go catch. You don't want to go fishing. You want some certainty you're going to catch fish because you got to pay for all the overhead that you got. And so I think about, you know, you know we can talk about different things we could do but really I think the insanity that the end of the year the savings that people have put, have done as far as not to access these stocks on low ACLs, people go out and buy quota pounds where they're holding on to their little, a little bit of fish so they could not go out of business for the rest of the year. To lose that at the end of the year is like, I don't call it abusive, but it's nowhere in the world does that happen. If we didn't have a delayed spending account we would be meeting online right now. The entire world works different than we're managing fisheries. I just, I swear to God, it is just....it's insanity. We are..... so we're trying to do....what could we do? Obviously carryover, up the OFL, that's all great, but you know those fish were already declared dead. I mean so it's 600 ton, whatever it was, that we didn't catch last year so they're not available to us, a portion has it available to us at the end of the year. So I think that the construct that we should manage stocks or not overfish more than a year is just stupid given groundfish, I'm not saying sardines, I'm not saying salmon, because every stock's different, but groundfish are long-lived species. And you know you could take, you know, whatever you didn't catch this year you subtract your natural mortality and whatever else you might want to take off the top, but the catch streams going forward are assuming those fish are already dead. You can roll those quota pounds forward and operate with the other existing ACL that's been given to you and you're still going to be not overfishing because they're already assumed dead. And I don't know, well, it's in the National Guidelines, and I think that you know it's pretty apparent there wasn't an accountant in the room when they wrote the National Guidelines because they would have known better, because no one operates the way we try to operate fisheries. It is killing West Coast fisheries. In a matter of fact I think it's killing fisheries around the country. I've got a friend of mine in New England who said, man we would really like to have a rollover. And so the fact of the matter that we could actually, I mean, go to the end of the year, the wind blows, engine blows up, maybe you lose a net, which happened to us last year. I left 25,000 pounds of petrale in the water because we lost the net. I guess that's the cost of doing business, but it's the one that shouldn't be. So, you know, I think that the GAP statement was a really good one. Obviously they're constrained because there's things that supposedly we're told we can't do. But a real rollover is what we need to have within the constraints when the fishing isn't happening. I've talked to the GAP representatives, the environmental group representatives on the GAP the last two meetings and there's not an issue here. As long as you're not catching too much fish the first year, if you're just moving forward, It's not happening. And so, anyway I just think that... I get kind of a....kind of a walking through how you might do this. But you know if we had the 600 ton of canary this year, because we're not trying to catch it, we're trying to avoid it. I mean the trawl fleet, it's just, it is your teddy bear, your security blanket, whatever it is, that you're not going to

get put out of business so you're holding on to that thing. And so the stocks you see in canary, for instance, I mean we're not fishing in the closed areas of the EFH areas where we used to target them back in the day. They're in the mud flats and we're just trying to avoid them. But you know if we had those fish available to us, they're already declared dead, we could use those this year and we have this year's quota pounds and then we have what I call the FPs, the freedom pounds see. And basically they would free up the economies of this West Coast to thrive. And those FPs, we all call it, if they would go forward and they would sunset at the end of the year, and you might use it, you might not. And then next year we'd have another.....We'd have this year's quota potentially to work off if we didn't use up all the last year's quota, and the problem we're having with canary would not be happening this year. It would....we'd have less fish going forward, and over time if it stayed that way we would learn to live with it. But it would certainly cushion the pain we're feeling. It would be a rheostat instead of a light switch, because the light switch is killing us. And so I appreciate what we've heard so far. This is a process we're moving forward. But I tell you what, if we don't change things, woof. I mean the National Marine Fisheries Service folks went up down the coast and were shocked what they saw. We've been telling them that it's there, but to see it with their own eyes it's not pretty. So anyway, I'll quit there. Appreciate your time listening to me go on but we need to do better, and we need to have the tools. And what I'm saying, we've been put in a box and we need get out of that box and sometimes that box wasn't created by us. It's not necessarily our fault. We're just operating in the environment that's been given to us, but that's not necessarily etched in stone. I think there's ways around this and hopefully we can make some real effort over the upcoming months ahead. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:56] Thank you. Butch Smith, Lynn Mattes, then I'll look to my right for the next hand. Butch.

**Butch Smith** [00:17:01] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I support 100% what Brad said. And I don't necessarily know how they make the sausage but I understand in this business wandering the halls aimlessly for 35 years and once in a while sneaking into the GAP room before they realize I've been there and they kick me out, that's not true they've never kicked me out, but I've been in there plenty of times when all the different fishermen are sitting in the four corners of the room with their arm folded. And I've witnessed what's coming out of this now where fishermen are working with fishermen to make a better solution. Jessi down there gave an awesome report. She always carries this set of 64 crayons with a sharpener to explain it to Butch and I usually get to understand that when she's done. But I too am from a coastal community, and at one time we had 10 or 12 draggers, excuse me, trawlers in our port supporting each one of them, supported up to eight people each in the cannery on filet lines. They're not there anymore. Our cannery is, you know, muddling along at best in Ilwaco at this point in time and hope for, it does better but. So when I see fishermen working together, and the eloquent testimony from Heather and Jaime and others, and I don't see a huge much of pushback from our side of the table, I kind of get this is a good thing and it should be moving forward to see if we can do just what Brad said because it's tough out on the coast. And if there's fish out there to catch, by all the conservation needs and goals, and like Brad said, if you don't catch them, you know they don't die, they're like sturgeon, if you don't catch them they don't die. I understand that. Salmon if you don't catch them they do die, but we have enough to get back to the river. So I understand that too. But I just see nothing but good that could come out of this and certainly worth the time to invest in this potentially what

could be a great solution. And so I'm in support of moving this forward and thank you for letting me talk.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:54] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:19:56] Thank you Vice-Chair. In the presentation from Miss Waller it didn't show that this body has taken up a lot of these issues in the past. And I'm having flashbacks to late nights in the GMT room where we were working late into the evening. Miss Waller, Mr. Patrick Mirick, who was on the team at the time, Patrick pulling his hair out as we were working on the analysis of these things. And on what, three or four of them we got to a certain point, brought it to the Council, and the Council said that's nice, we've got another priority now quit working on it. So it was conscious decisions by this body, which had a very different makeup at the time. All that being said, getting the GAP and all the various sectors of the GAP to come together and agree on a priority list and in an order of priority I think was definitely a yeoman's task. What was on the initial list is too much for us to consider. If everything's a priority nothing is a priority. So really appreciate the GAP providing not just these are the things we prioritize, but the order in which you would like them prioritized, and I think that's going to be helpful moving forward that, okay, we look at this first, this second, and then as we have time more to go there. So really appreciate the work that the industry and the.....outside of the GAP, the industry, as well as the GAP members, and trying to come up with these are the things we would like to have you all look at first to try to help provide solutions. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:32] Thank you. Let me look around. A fair amount of discussion. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:21:43] Thank you Vice-Chair. I have a motion if folks don't have any more to say at the moment, but I'm happy to wait if there's additional discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:53] I detected enough of a pause that let's have the motion to stimulate discussion.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:22:04] So I move that the Council direct staff to develop a concise problem statement using the discussion of fleet impacts in Agenda Item E.7.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1. Establish the scope of the action to include the following measures in priority order. 1: Is ABC carryover. 2: Is phase-in ABC control rule. 3: Mid-biennium harvest specification change or green light. 4: Off the top accounting change. 5: Annual specifications. And the third bullet is task staff with opening a dialogue with the SSC on the scientific aspects of how their fishing level recommendations for preventing overfishing could be established for multi-year periods. For example, rolling averages of catch versus the ABC. And I want to correct that the purpose of considering overfishing risk over a multi-year period is to facilitate ABC carryover and similar ideas for pooling the risks created by the variability and catch experience within many fishery sectors. The desired outcome of this action is to mitigate the issues outlined in the problem statement and provide access and stability for diverse groundfish participants in fishing communities.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:20] Okay, thank you and I think you tried to change...

**Aja Szumylo** [00:23:23] Yeah, if "this" could be.....the underlined "this" could be changed to "the".

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:31] Perfect. With that change, what appears on the screen looks accurate and complete. Do you agree?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:23:37] Yes.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:37] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Marc Gorelnik. Please speak to your motion.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:23:44] Thank you. So first, just offering again appreciation for the GAP and the GMT for their reports on these items. That made the motion very easy to put together to be able to pull the recommendations directly from them. There was pretty strong alignment between the GMT and GAP Reports on the first four items, but the GMT didn't offer a priority so I'm pulling the priority from the GAP. And then I'll speak a little bit more about annual specifications in a second. I also appreciate the depth of discussion that was offered under inseason yesterday, maybe that was? Okay, whenever that was, many days, many moons ago when we discussed inseason, I will not repeat all of that here but just ask you guys to call that discussion back into your brains as you're thinking about the importance of these changes and flexibility that they'll provide for the fleet, especially with what they're facing this year. With annual specifications, because of my experience at the agency I have a more optimistic view of how that approach could align with what industry is asking for under mid-biennium specification changes or green light. In my mind, what's being asked for is being able to bring scientific information into decision-making a lot sooner. So just being able.....and this year with quillback as an example, if we move through the assessment process and have results late in the year, if we had a process that could pick up those results quickly without breaking apart the biennium we'd be able to more easily roll that new scientific information into regulation. So in my mind and in fisheries that I've experienced in the past, annual specifications does not necessarily mean changing every single number for every single stock every year. And it can be really low workload. The way that we have our biennium specifications process structured right now is very high workload, but I'd like to see what the difference is in the vision for a mid-biennium or green light process is compared to an annual specifications process, and to see those kind of played out in detail so that we can consider them against each other in making a decision for this fishery. I did not include multi-year average catch policies because the rationale provided in the staff report and the examples that I've seen from NOAA fisheries headquarters around the country are that those types of approaches are really used for data-poor or data-limited stocks. But the third bullet there is seeking conversations with the SSC on preventing overfishing on a multi-year time scale, and that's more to facilitate this risk buffering idea and exploring how to manage annual carryover. So it's a shifted discussion, just there's a little bit of a nuance and difference in what that multiyear look would be in the alternative that's analyzed in the staff document and what we're asking for here. There are several ideas in the GAP Report that focused on scientific information and addressing that side of the equation for supporting fisheries, and I think that.....well I know that I've added a lot of that consideration into the Executive Order response under item D.2 later today. And then there's some of that that can be picked up through the recent Council contract that Director Burden discussed that we have with Linker on evaluating, independently evaluating our stock assessment process. And then there's also our upcoming stock



assessment planning and Terms Of Reference item coming up in March 2026, and so I think that that can provide a venue to start pulling in some of the thoughts that are there. And then I have some other overarching thoughts on how to reconsider our science to management pipeline that'll come up under D.2. And then the last note is just the tie with this action back to our flexible and adaptive management special project and that anything that we learn here in implementing these overarching framework type activities can be pushed out into other FMPs that have similarities to what we're dealing with groundfish. And I know during that discussion CPS came up as another big example. I know that there are a lot of differences here, but hopefully we can develop these items with an eye towards applicability in other Council FMPs as well. So with that I'll stop.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:28:34] Thank you Aja. Questions regarding the motion? Questions for clarification? Jessi Waller.

**Jessi Waller** [00:28:44] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, Miss Szumylo. I just wanted to clarify on item Number 1, ABC carryover. Are you supporting.....the GAP talked about both approaches so where we could use the ACL buffer as well as moving up the ABC? So there was two approaches outlined in the National Standard 1 guidelines. So I'm guessing you want to scope both of those as the GAP recommended?

**Aja Szumylo** [00:29:06] Yes, I'd like to match the GAPs recommendation. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:29:12] Any other questions for clarification? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:29:21] Thanks Vice. I think this may be a question for possibly Aja, possibly Jessi. And please feel free to slap my paw if I'm out of line here with my questioning. But looking at this I'm thinking about if we were to move this forward, what other things that are sort of in our queue or on our docket, especially given the severe cutbacks that we're hearing about at NMFS and budget cutbacks for the states, like is there a vision about which one of those things could be postponed or which one of those things not going to happen? I feel like I heard pretty strongly from industry throughout the week that this is very important and so that this supersedes potentially some of those actions. I'm also cognizant that this might be a conversation for workload planning. But I did just want to give Aja or Jessi an opportunity or maybe even Keeley to speak to that. And even if that's just getting that conversation started so there's shared awareness about sort of what are the trade-offs here and now and sort of, what are the impacts for folks if we're taking some things off our plate?

**Pete Hassemer** [00:30:35] Thank you. I think that's a fair question. There's workload and there's other parts in there but we'll figure out who wants to take the first shot. Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:30:46] I can start. Thank you for the question. Hold onto your butts for the D.2 list if you're concerned about....(laughter)...that is a list. So I think that is a workload question is all. But yeah, I think... yeah, I see a lot of synergy here with what's being asked for in the Executive Order as well. And yeah, we've heard over and over from industry that this is such a high priority that it does supersede other items. I've reflected back on the conversations that have come up through the last couple of weeks with items like, one example is the Midwater Rockfish EFP, and

I recognize like moving that one into regulation would ease some burdens for industry in terms of administration of an EFP, but I think that the benefits that would come up across the board, across all sectors for this item, I think if we ask many of the industry members here in the room that they would pick this one and willingly forego some of the other things that were in the queue for the changes that would come up here.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:31:55] Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:31:58] Thank you. I think, yes, this definitely gets into a workload planning discussion so I won't get into that too much. But I will note, I think I said this already, but if I haven't, you know we did hear the urgency from the industry and the Council on this action so we already did set something down. We set down the gear switching rule and development on that. I will say generally though what we will look to do is, as we have in my view gotten really good at, is working with Council staff leadership in between while the meeting is going on to inform future workload planning and as always that's a constant conversation about sort of what the workload capacity looks like on both ends for NMFS, right? We're looking at that balance between supporting Council action development and then doing the rulemaking and implementation of the things you've already decided. So there is an admin flow there. It is actually a constant conversation, and there are often things that will sort of move on a very short-term basis that doesn't necessarily rise to the level of a bigger Council conversation, and I think we would do that in this scenario to be able to evaluate kind of what that looks like for both of our staffs.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:33:10] Thank you. Executive Director Burden.

**Merrick Burden** [00:33:14] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And just to add to the responses that I think Aja and Keeley are, I'm in full agreement with them, but this will make for a fairly in-depth September discussion about our workload prioritization and management. So this item is technically a scoping item. The next one, D.2 is a development of a preliminary list and we finalize that in September, so that's where a lot of this will converge and hopefully we'll have clarity about our fiscal status at that point too, so it could make for a meaty September discussion.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:33:53] Thank you. Other discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:34:00] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks Aja for the motion as I'm pleased. This feels like an issue that everyone is wanting to work on and it's nice to have a common goal to work towards. I like when Brad speaks in length because he usually has very visual analogies and metaphors that I want to go on to like, to be an artist it helps to walk through the trees, and we all have our own talents and I walk through a lot of forests and you're going to get some ugly looking trees if I try to paint them. But the, so I'm also thinking of some of the statements about our.....who knows better between the GAP or the GMT, and I think this process brings together the both of best, the practical knowledge of those who have to make a living from this with the folks trained in various techniques, and that's our strength. And I just want to speak to that briefly about the bullet of tasking staff with the dialogue of the SSC because a lot of what Brad was saying I think we've long agreed with. And it's a myopic focus on the word annual instead of the goal of preventing overfishing and achieving optimum yield. And I had dinner last night with a colleague who was on the GMT, Rosemary Kosaka about 12 years ago, and she asked what we were doing

and I said, oh we're working on this and this idea and she's like, oh yeah, the one that Andre Punt said would be a good idea like 12 years ago. And so we have the SSC telling us that the biology, the literature tells us we can, we can use a.....it's not every....overfishing doesn't happen in one year. If you go over your OFL by a tiny bit it's a longer term phenomena. So getting that dialogue with the SSC and them to open their minds a bit, or to give their advice more to their scientific learning than maybe some of our, what we think the National Standards allow for and the Magnuson Act allows for. I'm thinking again of albacore tuna where we just went through the Harvest Control Rule discussion the last year or two, which is an SPR-based Control Rule just like our groundfish Control Rules in there. You know as long as your catch is bouncing around that SPR rate you're achieving your objectives. And so we take that approach there and I think there's more room in the Magnuson Act for that approach here. But that is the foundation. I think we could build a lot of this on and have something like the carryover have a lot more benefit than the way it's kind of narrowly constricted in certain interpretations. And lastly, I think, you know on this, on the worry of the.....I pointed out that P Star, asked Dr. Marshall about that P-Star graph not just for fun, but I think it really, I think it speaks to.....a lot of folks around this horseshoe as Dr. Lange called it, which was a new one for me, have thought this idea that Sigma takes into account all scientific uncertainty, but what that Sigma does is it just, it defines that shape that you saw there of those blue bars. And what those blue bars tell you is that the assessment thinks that the OFLs are somewhere within that shape, not in the middle. And so that's, I think when people start to think in distributions instead of point estimates that's really helped me understand what we're doing better. But it doesn't apply just to the OFL, but it applies to these allocations we make to the various sectors. And we're issuing IFQ pounds with the implicit assumption that they're 100% likely to be used, and we know that's not true. So there's a way of using distributions and probability better to achieve our goal of getting us closer to the ACLs while helping individuals get their target species. I had one more thought but I lost it. So yeah, I think we can work on these things and this is probably just the first cut at them. But yeah, I think at this multi-year.....if we open our minds to the preventing overfishing and optimum yield instead of annual, annual, annual, there's ways of setting aside like an insurance pool that you can draw from over the course of years, not just for the IFQ program, but for the recreational fishery program, fisheries, and for something like canary rockfish. But yeah I look forward to continuing to make progress on these items.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:03] Thank you Corey. Any other discussion on the motion? Seeing no hands for discussion I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:39:19] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:39:20] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Aja. I'll look around and see, before going to Jessi for a summary, any more motions, discussion? Not seeing hands, Jessi, what more should we do here?

**Jessi Waller** [00:39:40] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I believe you have finished your Council task for today. So you've given us some very clear direction, including some scope on five items to start looking at in depth. You've also tasked us with starting to work with the SSC on another idea about these multi-year fishing periods. So Council and NMFS staff will take this all back and we'll come back at a later time with regards to next steps on this meeting on this agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:40:10] All right, thank you. It sounds like we've completed our work. I'll look around and make sure that looks correct. So I will close out this agenda item.

## 8. 2027-28 Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Planning

**Pete Hassemer** [00:00:00] There is no public comment on this so that will move us into our Council task, which I believe the....well, is that the entirety of it there? I think you know what they are and you can reference lists. So who wants to start the discussion? Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:00:29] Thank you Vice-Chair. You know this may seem simple that we're here adopting a schedule, but adopting the spex schedule is an important piece of what we do to begin each cycle. There are a number of benchmarks, timelines, deadlines that have to be met and if one gets slowed down it can have a steamroller, big snowball going down the mountain effect, and affect other things. And I think this cycle it's going to be even more important, given some of the challenges our colleagues at NMFS are going to dealing with just with short, lower staff numbers and sometimes taking longer to get through headquarters. So the schedule that we're adopting and hopefully all agreeing to will be important that we all do our best to stick to it and hold our own feet to the fire on many things. Every cycle something comes up and it gets goobered up, but we just need to do our best. When it comes time, I do have some guidance for the GMT for some over-winter work, not over-winter, over-summer work. It's June, not January. But yeah, this is just helping lay out the work plan for the next basically year as we work on the 27-28' harvest specifications. And I'm really bummed I didn't get to see Todd's presentation because I don't know anything about spex and I wanted all of us to see the wheel of doom or the spiral of doom.....(laughter).....thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:02:06] Thank you Lynn. Other discussion? Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:02:11] Thank you. I just want to go back to the conversation that was happening with the GMT and the GAP around canary rockfish and just recognize this is something that WDFW has talked about for the last couple of spex cycles and our interest to just simply look at the biennial specifications. That's typically what we do in spex. It is one of the routine things that we look at is our biennial harvest specifications. I 100% understand that canary is a challenge for everyone and that it is a big topic and that it's hard and for all sectors and that, and in the interest of not getting into an allocation battle, I understand that. So I think what the GMT had in their report I really appreciate. I view that as getting all the tools and information we have available so that we can make good decisions in September about how we want to direct the GMT on their spex analysis as they get started, and I thank them for teeing that up now. I also want to talk about canary in the context of the fantastic conversation that we just had under E.7. I think that's also a really....I'm excited about it and it clearly from the conversation that the Council had and the public, there are some really neat things that can provide relief and hopefully for canary too, and I'm looking forward to that, and if we can get there with that approach and that flexibility, that spex flex, that would be terrific. So I just wanted to speak to this conversation around canary, be very transparent about the interest there, very similar to last year, or last spex cycle, and also recognize that thinking about it in the context of spex flex as well. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:04:43] Thank you Heather. Caroline McKnight.

**Caroline McKnight** [00:04:46] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you Heather for those comments. I guess leading right off of that, I was listening under the E.7 agenda item, and not

because I want to ask the question again, but I think I heard that there were some ad hoc opportunities to explore a few of those flex measures in spex. And so I guess by way of talking about or verifying, just trying to understand if.....sounds like there might be some possibility to do that. And I don't think it needs to be fleshed out here today, but since this is our kickoff planning meeting and we're talking about the schedule, it seems like I just want to get confirmation that I'm not completely off base, that there might be some opportunity. And what I'm thinking specifically is the context of the canary we've heard about this week that is constraining our trawl fisheries and the shortspine that's constraining our non-trawl fisheries. And Petrale similarly, those three that were mentioned in the inseason report. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:05:50] Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:05:52] Thank you. I'll take that one. The only tool that we have in the toolbox right now is an ad hoc ABC control rule change. We could do that in spex if that was appropriate and the direction that we wanted to go. That is, right, part different than what we're talking about under spex flex. We're talking a different tool so there's a distinction there. I think there's a tool we've used twice, I think we've use it. That certainly exists but it is not the same suite of things that we're talking about under spex flex.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:33] Thank you. Other questions? Discussion? Sorry. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:06:42] Thank you Vice-Chair. I didn't see any other hands popping up, so I do have a motion and then following that I have some guidance as well. So whenever we're ready.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:06:54] I believe we are ready.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:06:58] All righty, the rockstar's in the back already have it ready for me. I move the Council adopt the schedule and plan for the 27-28' Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Process as outlined in Agenda Item E.8, Supplemental Revised Attachment 1 from June 2025.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:21] The language on the screen appears accurate and complete. Do you agree?

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:25] Yes sir it does, other than an A that's capitalized that probably doesn't need to be in, "Adopt" after Council. But the language is correct. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:07:33] Perfect. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:07:42] Thank you Vice-Chair. I don't know that I need to speak much more to it. I already mentioned it, but this is our roadmap for how we do spex and one item leads into the next, and we just need to be sure to keep up with that list and that schedule, and a lot of work ahead of us over the next 12 months.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:02] All right, any questions for clarification on the motion? Discussion on the motion? Not seeing any hands so I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

**Council** [00:08:19] Aye.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:08:20] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. Why don't we just move along with the guidance piece.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:08:29] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I did write this out just so it was a little easier for all of us to look at. And one of our tasks under this agenda item was guidance for possible over-summer work. So I do request the GMT, Council and NMFS staff, whoever is going to be involved in spex, I don't know who all that team would be, I'm assuming Todd and somebody else, begin to examine canary rockfish allocations building off of the work conducted for the 25-26' harvest specifications which was in Supplemental GMT Report 2 from March of 2024 in preparation for the upcoming 27-28' biennial process. To do that use historical sector-specific sharing and mortality which I have listed below as a starting place. The 2015-2016 specification sharing, which was the last sharing before the 2015 assessment. 2016 mortality by sector, which was last year before the higher ACLs resulting from the 2015 assessment. 2017-18 specification sharing, which was the first sharing with the higher ACLs resulting from the 2015 assessment. 2024 mortality by sector, which is the most recent year of full mortality.....(audio noise)...okay, and 2025 specification sharing, which is the most recent specification sharing. And with those it's looking at the percentage by sector, not using the metric tons to develop percentages to look at sharing. And then the next two come out of the GAP recommendations on, look at subtrip limits for shelf rockfish complex north of 40°10' and explore changes to the California recreational fishery to remove recreational Rockfish Conservation Areas in favor of management via subbag limits only.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:36] Okay. Is that the complete....okay.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:39] That is the end of it.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:40] All right.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:40] Yes, they got it all onto the screen.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:42] I watched the little slider there, I'm not sure if there's more so.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:10:47] Nope. That's everything that was in the written guidance that I tried to provide.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:10:52] All right. A response. Is there agreement with that guidance or discussion on it? Keeley Kent.

**Keeley Kent** [00:10:58] I just had a question. Just trying to....I think look back at the GMT report there were some requests for engagement from the GAP. And I'm just wondering, Lynn, if you view this as the starting place and then there would be further discussion and exploration with the

GAP or the members of the GAP that want to engage on this? Just sort of trying to capture that piece because that was a specific thing that GMT brought up.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:11:23] Through the Vice-Chair, Miss Kent, I did not specifically speak to that. It was an oversight, but I do believe this would be a starting point to get those conversations going this summer. And I'm seeing a couple of head nods around with that intent. But yes, to try.....I don't know if we need to add a line to the guidance, but since the guidance isn't that formal, yes, request the GAP, or the GMT recommendation to work with those interested parties in the GAP exploring this further. And I'm sorry, we're just starting to get a little tough at this point in the afternoon.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:03] Keeley, a follow-up?

**Keeley Kent** [00:12:04] Thanks. I appreciate that and I think that's helpful. I also appreciate the specificity of the guidance. I think that really gets at some of what happened the last time around on canary, so I think that's a good starting place. But I also want to note because it is explicit in the request that NMFS staff engage on this, right? At this point we're only staffing the specifications with a single person. In the past cycles we've had two or more. I view this as a good task for the GMT and the GAP and Council staff, but I would just, I want to be transparent that I would put it lower on our priority list as we look at all of the spex tasks that we need to work through.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:12:51] Lynn.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:12:52] Through the Vice-Chair, Miss Kent, yeah, I tried to leave it general not knowing who exactly was going to be on the analytical team and who would have time when, request the analytical team, those who are going to working on it, but understand the limitations that NMFS is under and the limited reduced staffing available for this process.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:13:13] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:13:16] Thank you Vice-Chair. And I think relative to canary, I'm considering the discussion that we had earlier under inseason. And then Miss McKnight's comment just now about trying to think through like what ad hoc approaches might be available. I'm wondering if, yeah, this guidance could come up specific to canary, but I guess it's applicable everywhere, but I'm wondering if it makes sense to have some kind of guidance motion about like, be mindful of using ad hoc approaches if possible to create flexibility for the fleet. But as I'm saying this out loud I'm realizing there might be a place for it somewhere else other than in this specific motion that really is geared towards canary. So I'll leave it there. That's not really a question. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:10] Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:14] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. Did I hear that right that they wanted to, for the GMT and the Council, and NMFS staff, and the two GAP members that want to change the allocation, is that....is that what I heard here?



**Pete Hassemer** [00:14:30] Well, maybe I should let Lynn to speak. But what I heard is it's somewhat undefined yet, the workgroup that would do that in this early phase. But let me turn to Lynn and then possibly Todd to see how we would formulate this here. And again this is guidance, so I'm going to look around and make sure. We're not I'm going to vote on it, but see if there's head nods agreeing with this. There's more we can add of course, or any objections to it. So Todd, your interpretation of the team that would do this work.

**Todd Phillips** [00:15:12] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It would be my interpretation that I would bring forward, well I bring the GMT along in a meeting group, determine who would do what and on what timeline. This would occur shortly after this meeting when our brains are back and functioning. And at that time we would essentially develop a process and plan to tackle these topics here, and obviously assign leads or sub-leads to each individual item based on the specialty of the GMT members, noting of course that these would highly, not highly, excuse me, these would be more linked to the State representatives on the team rather than it would be the National Marine Fisheries Service representatives or the Tribal representative.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:01] Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:16:06] Thank you for that Todd. And yeah, when I look at just the canary bullet, this is really just a historical view of how the sharing has worked. It's not really a high workload or analytic analysis at all. It's simply providing the background on how those biennial specifications have worked. And I think the timelines there are really good there before rebuilding in the 2015 stock assessment and then in the periods after that, and there were just some changes there and certainly our Washington GMT representatives can can work on that.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:52] Todd.

**Todd Phillips** [00:16:52] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Another thing that I would mention is the Council probably should not expect a fully fleshed out analysis like you've come to see in the spex processes. These would be something that would be informative and that the Council could use to ask for further in depth and detailed analyzes if that's appropriate.

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

**Caroline McKnight** [00:17:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I think I'm going to ask a specific question. I'm not sure it's for Heather or for Todd, but I guess I'm looking at this as an opportunity over summer, like you said Heather, to provide a general understanding of where the boxes have been drawn relative to canary, and that traditionally September has been the meeting where we put a formal list together for what's moving forward for continued analysis. And we do have a few other things here. This is what I view as early guidance. It does not presume that these things will or will not make the cut in this exact form or will advance. So for example, we have a request on the table to ask for a catch-only update for canary rockfish. That information, presumably if it gets approved and time is made for it, it comes in September and may change the landscape of this particular set of information and guidance in front of us that might lend to a different outcome. I just... that's my feeling on how we're approaching this. I'm just, I'm looking for the same level of like, are we on the same page in terms of what this guidance means?

**Heather Hall** [00:18:23] Yeah, we're on the same page.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:18:28] Thank you. That clarification is good. Keep us there. Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:18:32] Thank you Vice-Chair. On that piece, when we were talking about canary last cycle it came in too late, and I think at that time we all agreed that we needed to start taking a look at it early because it affects all the sectors. So bringing this up now is the chance to sort of set the stage for those discussions later as part of the spex. And then to get to Chair Pettinger's question about two members of the GAP. It was some members of the GAP. In the GAP statement they said some members are interested in the canary. So we will.....I anticipate whoever in the GAP is interested in participating and providing information will be involved. I don't think it will be limited to a specific number of GAP members. We're just trying to be sensitive to the GAP Report that says some members of the GAP are interested. Hopefully as many as possible will be participating so that we get some well-rounded information. So not trying to jump the line on presupposing anything with September, November and spex. And yeah, the update on canary could change the landscape we're looking at. I think we're all trying to come at the canary issue from a variety of directions hoping one or two of them will stick and provide some relief.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:19:52] Chair Pettinger.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:19:55] Thank you Vice-Chair Hassemer. I think it'd be good just to make sure we go through the GAP Chairs, make sure that's the proper protocols there. I'm just kind of wondering also what with the 2015-16 are still overfished, you know those are overfished allocations and just trying to get through to the rebuilt stock. I'm not sure what that's going to do for you in the grand scheme of things. We're not overfished now and I think that might, I think maybe not spend much time on that or any at all. Just to move forward with the current situation more clarity would rise from that so. Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:20:35] Heather Hall.

**Heather Hall** [00:20:37] I think just to have that information would be helpful. It's the pre-2015 assessment and then we have post and I think it bookends the information that we have. It's just simple information. So I'd like to make sure that the 15-16' specifications are in there.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:03] All right, thank you. Let me look around. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:21:06] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I just have a question about allocation. I'm trying to find this in the background document. But this list seems to point to history of landings and mortality as the key factors. Are they the only factors that will be considered? And this is not a list that would preclude using other information? Thank you.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:21:30] Lynn Mattes.

**Lynn Mattes** [00:21:32] Thank you Vice-Chair, Dr. Lent. No, that is not to preclude anything. It's just to show of a base of where we've been, how this has been allocated in the past to maybe look as a starting point to show and to, with the specification showing how it was allocated and then

the mortality to show what was actually used. It's solely to serve as a base point to start or a jumping point, off point to serve as for the analysis. It's not intended to presuppose anything.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:22:08] All right, other discussion? And this is guidance. I want to make sure everybody's clear with that. If there's any objections to it make sure you state those or anything else you'd like to have added. Otherwise, I'm going to look to Todd and ask him here, we've had a motion and we have some guidance and maybe summarize what this sets in place into the future and what we've done. Thanks.

**Todd Phillips** [00:22:40] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. So the motion approves the Supplemental Revised Attachment 1, which is the process and plan for essentially the next year of meetings regarding the harvest specifications and management measures process. I will note that the revisions were based, some of the revisions were based off the SSCs earlier comments in their statement, and that was obviously adopted. The guidance is specific in this case to canary rockfish regarding allocations and information the Council would like to see come forth in September to inform your decision-making process potentially about any type of allocation changes or considerations for canary. You also have two other items there, one being the looking at individual species trip limits within the harbor of the stock complexes north of 40°10'. And I am forgetting about the last one, but there is another piece of guidance there that was quite clear it just is escaping my brain at the moment. I would say yes Mr. Vice-Chair and Council, you have completed the tasks before you and you can conclude this agenda item.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:23:56] All right, let me look around one last time, make sure everybody's comfortable with this, said their piece. Seeing nothing additional then we will close out this agenda item. Thank you all for your work on that.

## **F. 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 will take care of our public comment and it takes us to Council action, which is before you. So I'll open up the floor for discussion as needed. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:17] Thank you and good morning, or I think it's morning still.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:23] It's still morning.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:23] I just wanted to voice my support for the HMSAS. I always appreciate their leadership and guidance on international activities for HMS and I appreciate their proposals 1 through 5 at the top of their report. I support those. I wanted to emphasize that we have always supported the efforts to change the split between what California fishermen get and what our international partners get and that 70-30 split would be more appropriate. I also support the need for the State Department to continue to request approval to negotiate with Canada on albacore and hearing from the public and Mr. Wraith and the AS description of need for outreach and gathering more information from the fleet when discussing albacore limits for the future, appreciate that and support that. And also support the seeking progress on the circle hook decision, so I just wanted to offer that as a starting point and guidance to NMFS and the State Department.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:47] Thank you John. Anyone else? Christa Svensson.

**Christa Svensson** [00:01:49] Yeah, thank you. I am in alignment in terms of supporting the HMSAS and really thank you for putting recommendations at the top where they're in bold and easily found. I just wanted to add a little bit of thought around a couple of these. You know we have consistently heard over the years from the fleet about total allowable effort, so just putting another pin there that we hear you and that that has been consistent messaging that we've heard from our advisors and not just the ones that we have sitting in chairs but when they come in and publicly testify. We heard a little bit of comment about the number of vessels and that may be important in terms of.....there was a comment about building capacity, and I just want to recognize for a second that it isn't necessarily that we're building capacity, it's more that we are using the capacity that we have historically used. And I say that because I, this is shockingly to me my 20th season of dealing with albacore, and I went back and I was looking at what we were catching when I started because I remembered it being about 10,000 metric tons, and lo and behold it was. Last year we caught just under 5,000, so a little less than half of what we have historically done. And I'm not suggesting that that is related to anything other than to say that it is not surprising that we have fewer boats prosecuting less fish. So If we have the opportunity, and some of that depends on where the fish are, when they're closer to shore we have more boats, when they're further from shore we have fewer boats. When fish are further offshore and fuel costs as much as it does now we have fewer people going out and looking for fish, which means fewer fishermen. So there are any number of reasons, but I do want to urge some caution on setting expectations for today when that is not the number of vessels that we have traditionally had when we're thinking about how to move forward and recommendations that this Council should be making. I'll just reiterate, because I didn't see it in the report but we have heard it repeatedly, that in terms of conducting bilateral

conversations with Canada, doing that early in the process is always beneficial so that we don't run into people taking off during the fishing season and not having the opportunity to get shipyard work, et cetera, done. And I think with that I will close my comments, but appreciate the work that was done by the advisory panels and very supportive of their advice.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:16] All right, thanks Christa. Anyone else? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:05:22] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. In agreement with John and Christa. And yeah, if you're not allowed to talk to someone I can see why you can't reach agreement, so hopefully our negotiators are allowed to do that. I'm going to zero in on the North Pacific albacore and Christa's total allowable effort. Yeah, and we've heard that our longtime advisor Doug Fricke was a really big proponent and explained, you know, that's how the Oregon salmon troll fishery works versus Washington's, which works on quotas, and it's basically, you know, quotas can be off and if the fish show up you get shut down prematurely, so there's good rationale behind it. The thing that I'm not seeing and if everyone else is seeing and they might be, is that total allowable effort is still aiming at an amount of catch and it's the 70-30 thing, like what would we be aiming at if this were ever to get into the lower abundance levels? And again, this is like, It's almost the thinking what Sam Rauch, the discussion with Sam Rauch yesterday about why things, why landings may have dropped, and the albacore, this like the magical fishery. We don't do anything to it and it stays and I just keep knocking on wood every time I think about it that it's been staying at above target without us doing anything at all to it. And we also talk, we don't talk about it a lot either so maybe that's another jinx. The more we talk about a fishery the less we catch in it. So yeah, what really.....this is a long way of saying to Ryan and NMFS, I hope...I meant to reach out before this meeting, but hopefully you can have some discussions. I would like to have had discussions as an agency with you and with the industry groups and others I'm sure about how we can take the next steps to getting people better informed. And lastly, because what I see is happening is this, we have a pretty precautionary harvest control rule. It's like a rockfish control rule for a stock that looks more like it has a flatfish life history. So when you.....if we get down to like B 20%, which is where the assessment is saying that MSY exists, and these tuna stocks don't show a big relationship between recruitment and biomass and we see the two or three-year-olds coming off this close, if it gets that low you're still going to see the salmon recruitment coming by as we've seen. And so how does that affect our.....you're not going to big drops in recruitment at that level, you wouldn't expect. It's always uncertain of course. So how does work in terms of total allowable effort and what our percentage would be? So there's a lot of details I don't understand and, yeah, I know that NMFS and others put a lot of effort into the MSE and maybe our fleet does understand it, but I think there's a lot more to understand before those discussions are made. And I'm still unclear on what happens at the international level versus the implementation stuff that happens at the domestic level. So Ryan that was a long way of saying I hope we can have more, not today necessarily, but talk more about what else could be done to prepare for this. And yeah, echoing Rebecca's thanks to the amazing negotiation and things you've achieved through negotiations so far.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:09] Thanks Corey. All right, anyone else? Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:09:15] Thank you Chair. Just to move forward, I assume that this Council action that we want to take, as I mentioned in my first intervention and I've heard again four times, I think

we all support these recommendations 1 through 5. Is it possible just to refer to those and Council nod or do we need to do something more formal? Thank you Chair.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:09:35] I haven't seen anybody shaking their heads so I think we're pretty good there. Okay, Ryan Wulff.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:09:39] Yeah thanks. Just appreciate Mr. Niles' comments. I'm happy to continue the conversation. Appreciate the AS Report and their recommendations as well. I do think we have some time, right? I think because I noted on albacore in particular, as I noted with the bluefin MSE with the tropical tuna measure, with a suite of other things that may be coming as it relates to bycatch, I think 2026 meeting is probably more relevant where you'll see some of the broader North Pacific albacore discussions happen again so happy to continue the dialogue in really all fora and formats as we look towards that. I did omit something in my report that I did want to highlight to folks because as I'm thinking through our Executive Order discussions that are happening, it reminded me that we have an Executive Order that the State Department is running, but I think the due date is between this and the next Council meeting. I think it's 180 days from February 4th. So according to that order, that is the State Department is ordered to review the U.S. participation in every single international treaty that we are a part of and also provide funding to and to make recommendations to the President on whether or not we should continue to be in those organizations. So I did just want to highlight that's obviously not a, I don't think there's a notice and public comment process on that one, but that we may have more information when we get to our next meeting. I don't raise that just to highlight that I have any concern about the commissions that we're talking about. It seems to be very targeted over non-fisheries related organizations, but did just want to note that for the record.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:11:47] Okay, thanks Ryan. Anyone else? All right Kerry, how are we doing here?

**Kerry Griffin** [00:11:56] I think you're doing pretty good. This question of guidance versus motion came up in discussion and I think it was the guidance last year as well on this agenda item. And it sounds like there was some general support among the Council members for the recommendations in the HMSAS Report. And I think if there are no further questions or guidance to be conveyed then I think that would conclude your business under this agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:12:24] Okay, very good.

]

### 3. Exempted Fishing Permits – Final Action

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right Council Action. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:00:04] Thanks Mr. Chair. Appreciate this item. I support approval of these to go to NMFS for their approval. I support extending the existing one. I appreciate that the individual on that existing one has been the only individual to actually try to fish this and has been successful. I think we need more effort in night-set to help us, advise us to whether we want to approve this as a gear type. I will say that if we get five, ten more applications for night-set, I won't be interested until we see the results of these ones. I want to get the results but I don't want to do what we did with regular buoy gear and essentially create a fishery through EFPs. So just flagging that for future, but at this point I think we should move forward.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:04] Okay, thank you John. Any questions for the....for John? Okay, actually I thought you had a motion already but I'm sure you do, or somebody does. So anybody else?

**John Ugoretz** [00:01:21] Thanks, and I don't have a motion pre-written but if someone wants to grab the screen?

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:27] I think we're ready.

**John Ugoretz** [00:01:32] All right, thank you. I move that the Council forward the 2 new night-set buoy gear EFP applications in Attachments 1 and 2 to National Marine Fisheries Service for their review. And recommend to National Marine Fisheries Service to extend the EFP in Attachment 3.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:14] Okay. Is that language accurate?

**John Ugoretz** [00:02:17] Yes it is.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:18] Very good. Looking for a second. Seconded by Corey Ridings. Thank you Corey. Speak to your motion as appropriate.

**John Ugoretz** [00:02:25] I think we're okay there.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:26] Okay, there we go. Discussion or questions of the motion maker? Discussion on the motion? I see it's lunch time. All right, with that I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

**Council** [00:02:39] Aye.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:40] Opposed no? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. All right, Kerry.



**Kerry Griffin** [00:02:51] That concludes your business under this agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:54] Fantastic.

#### 4. Highly Migratory Species Roadmap Development

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] Takes care of our public comment and takes us to Council action, which is before us, so I'll open up the floor for discussion. Aja Szumylo.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:00:12] Thanks Chair. I have a question about the tie between the two-meeting process that's outlined here and the regulations for EFPs which discuss having a Federal Register Notice that falls over the Council meeting. And so the way that I'm reading this process right now is that....Yeah, I'm not clear that we're overlapping the Federal Register Notice portion of things with bringing the EFPs before the Council. So I'd love some clarification from folks about how they envision those two processes playing out together.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:04] Okay.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:01:05] Yeah Ryan, thank you. I'm trying to think about how the two-meeting process overlays with the regulations for publishing a Federal Register Notice describing the EFPs for public comment. And then the regulations also specifically discuss overlap, like if there is going to be Council input then it should overlap with this process.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:01:27] Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:01:27] Yeah, through the Chair, thank you Miss Szumylo for the question. Yeah, so the multiple meeting process is a result of the Council Operating Procedures. The regulations that NMFS has for issuing EFPs state that, well, first we have to review the application, decide whether it's warranted, right? And if we do, if we feel it's not warranted then we are required to notify the Council and the applicant in writing why not if we're not going to move forward with it, or if we just feel it's not warranted from the beginning. If we feel we have a complete application that is warranted, then the regs say that we may consult with the appropriate Council concerning the permit application during the period in which comments have been requested. So I would read that as, at least the reg's envision you would seek Council input once the Federal Register Notice is out for comment. Now we have done that frequently, that has been our practice, but we haven't always done that. Sometimes we've waited for the Council review of it and then put out a Federal Register Notice after, considering then applications would be complete. And I still think that that is also consistent with the regs, but it clearly does seem to lay out the Council engagement overlapping with that window, if I think that answers your question, yeah.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:02:54] Okay, anyone else? John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:02:56] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And going back to Aja's comment. Question, you're discussing a two-meeting process and noting that the recommendation of the F.I.W. with support of the HMSAS, HMSMT, and very importantly, a large number of commercial and recreational fishing representatives that participated in a workshop a year ago is to actually shorten that a one-meeting process where it's appropriate. And so that is one of the key revisions to COP 20 that we're seeking to look into in September is to streamline the process, allow it to be one meeting where appropriate and take applications two times a year rather than one time a year.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:03:49] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:03:49] Thank you John for that clarification. I just still think that given that there's a requirement for a Federal Register Notice to be published to accept comments, that it may make sense to try to overlay that with the Council meetings that they're going to be requesting comment. I recognize that that poses some challenges to how things have been playing out in the past, because I know that the Council has wanted to have a lot of input into the shape of the EFPs, but the point of the Federal Register Notice in my experience is to gather input that can inform the terms and conditions, the shape of the EFP in the future. And so I'm coming from a place of looking for efficiency and so I'm wondering if we'd considered that. I came into this part of the process late, so I am wondering what consideration was put into overlaying the two processes so that we weren't spending additional time that's not necessary.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:04:47] John.

**John Ugoretz** [00:04:47] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Aja for the clarification. And yes, that is the intent of having an F.I.W. and all of the effort that has been put into this over the last four years to make this process more efficient. As to whether it distinctly overlaps a Federal Register Notice by NOAA I think is somewhat, you know, aside to the discussion. The point is to get people out fishing EFPs faster. And notably that this is COP 20 and not COP 19 which deals with groundfish EFPs which you may have some more interest in discussing it at that September meeting as well. So, COP 20 has been in place for 25 years. It was last updated 8 years ago. It's certainly time to review it and try to make things more efficient. And I think we learned quite a bit through the buoy gear EFP process, and all of that along with the results of 68 participants at a multi-stakeholder workshop is how we got to where we are right now.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:05:58] Aja.

**Aja Szumylo** [00:05:58] Thank you Chair. Yeah, I'm well aware that we're talking about HMS here and not groundfish. I think that there is inefficiencies in both of the processes that I'm trying to think about so. And I know I came into this late, but I'm kind of....some of this discussion for me is I'm grafting this over to D.2 where we're going to discuss the Executive Orders. If we're making edits to the COPs, I think we should try to tighten the process up as much as possible. And so I just wanted to make sure that we were considering all of the steps that need to go into it in making things as efficient as we could. I don't, I know that a lot of industry has given input into how things flow, but I have a lot experience on the NOAA side of things and how things are playing out, and I think that, yeah, I just want to make sure that the right kinds of efficiencies are being built in all of this. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:07:00] Thank you Aja. All right, anyone else? Ryan.

**Ryan Wulff** [00:07:00] Yeah, just one comment here also on the timing. A different comment because it's relevant and I made this point in the FIW, but I want the Council to be aware of it too. I don't have a problem with the recommendation to move towards more treatment and I don't have a problem with looking at November and March versus June to September, but I just wanted to note that the reason, another reason why we had it, that was because NMFS collects fishing data

from HMS on their timeline, which is.....their fishing year is March, or April 1st through March 31st, right? So June is usually when we have data on the prior fishing year, so I don't think it's a big deal. It just means if you have a application in November the EFP data that we'll have will be, you know, from the fishing year prior, so just wanted to note that. I don't think it prevents us from doing that because I completely understand the rationale that was given us in the FIW and by the fishermen that the goal would be to then get on the water the same year or that they're trying to apply for so that makes sense to me. But I just wanted to also note that that was connected to why we had the June-September timeframe before as well. Thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:16] Thank you Ryan. All right, anyone else? Okay, Christa.

**Christa Svensson** [00:08:30] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I do have some guidance on this topic if we're through other discussion, but I don't think there's an intention of making a motion so I don't want to cut off discussion unless somebody comes out with a motion that I'm not aware of.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:08:54] Please.

**Christa Svensson** [00:08:54] Okay, so I've lined these out in terms of really the 5 pieces that I saw that came forward in the HMS Management Team Report. The first one is guidance to adopt the FIW Terms of Reference described in FIW Report 1. And that is related to having a TOR adopted will give us common language within the FIW so that we can move more quickly. And also, as I spoke to a little bit earlier, that the adoption of items like the TOR and the Roadmap will allow the FIW to focus on the work that they were tasked with rather than to continue splitting efforts in the work that we are doing. For my second point, to direct the FIW to provide recommended language for COP 20 to the Council during the September 2025 meeting. So that would be the membership appointments and COPs agenda item. And it may be Aja that you want to show up to the FIW meeting and help us out on that one, which is great. You know, it's an open meeting and we certainly have had a lot of people, but I think that the conversation we had would be beneficial in terms of that type of language. We have been exploring streamlining our EFP process to save the Council and applicant's time while balancing the need for sufficient consideration. I think the concept that was raised in the management team report to do a pre-assessment of EFP applications with NMFS should also be considered just because it could help with that timing. And it would also help set applicants' language within the applications and also their expectations. If you're doing something really far out you probably would be benefited in knowing that that is going to take a longer timeframe than something that we've already looked at on a number of occasions. For the third bullet point, it was task the FIW with prioritizing the development of HMS EFP performance goals, including acceptable bycatch and economic metrics to evaluate EFP performance. Performance metrics continue to be a topic of interest for a variety of stakeholders. And I think it's important to prioritize bycatch as well as economics. I also just want to say that I think we need to make sure that we do consider things like safety, fishing performance, or anything else that may come up as applicable. So just because those two items are prioritized, that does not mean we should not consider anything else. On point four, I think adopt the FIW work plan outline described in supplemental FIW Report 2, prioritizing production of an EFP application template and EFP application guidance as a document. So in adopting the work plan this would codify for the FIW that what we're working on is what we are working on and can serve as a prioritized punch list of topics. Codification of that work plan will also allow the FIW

to lean on advisors as appropriate in developing tools. So for example, the FIW can request that the HMS Management Team develop an application template for EFPs. This would support us as a Council in more quickly evaluating applications, but it would also help applicants develop their own projects, which this year's cycle has indicated that we may need to be a little proactive in that and help people in preventing confusion about what they should or shouldn't be including. And finally, to finalize the current Draft HMS Roadmap at the November meeting by bringing a clear version for final review. There's been quite a bit of discussion around the Roadmap, and in some cases what exactly is a living document? What does that mean? In looking at previous Council discussion we were all in alignment that the Roadmap is the way the Council can chart a path forward. The Roadmap would allow us to prioritize work and execute tactical components with the flexibility to change based on our political and or natural environmental conditions. The FIW is helping us make, or excuse me, move forward on a number of the EFP-specific issues that will enable us to make progress on our Roadmap goals. And in terms of the Roadmap, we don't need to continue working on reviewing and substantive editing at this point in time, but it would be beneficial for the Council to adopt the current guidelines and strike-throughs that we saw in our briefing book, and then to see a clean draft for any final edits based on further guidance from the FIW.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:14:01] Okay, Thank you Christa for that. Really good. John Ugoretz.

**John Ugoretz** [00:14:07] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Christa. That was a very nice summary and I'm hoping Kerry was able to capture it all, or perhaps you can share your notes with him. I really do appreciate that it clarifies that we aren't, you know, in quotations, "adopting a Roadmap at this meeting", but rather we're tasking the FIW to accept the edits that are in there now, clean it up, bring it back for November, and have it final as a living document at that point. I appreciate that and I think from everything we've heard that it's at a state where it can help guide us. If it needs changes in the future, so be it. We can talk about that. And I do, I want to come back to the Vice-Chair's question back, I forget whose report you asked it of, but regarding the bycatch metrics and what are we talking about here what is bycatch and what is performance. And I just want to lay it out that from my perspective and from what I've heard on the FIW, we're talking about the way the Council reviews both applications and active EFPs in terms of giving known goalposts and sideboards for what we think is acceptable. And clearly we have an idea of what we did not find acceptable. We went through multiple years of discussions for hard caps in the DGN fishery and more years of discussions in potentially revising those hard caps because the Council felt that even though the bycatch levels were within the legal limits, they weren't acceptable to the Council. And so that is what the FIW is trying to tackle is what is acceptable? What we're not trying to do is revisit hard caps for existing fisheries. And whatever we come up with as performance metrics is something that we will use as a Council when we're considering things and eventually forwarding them on to NMFS. When NMFS considers them they have the regulatory framework to go with as to whether something is legally within the limits. So I just wanted to clarify that. And I think just wrap up by noting that the FIW has been very clear both in our edits to the documents and our discussions that when we're talking about bycatch we're actually talking about protected and non-marketable species. We're not talking about non-target catch that is eventually sold, and I just wanted to make sure everybody had that in their brains as well. So thanks.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:16:53] Okay, thank you John. Vice-Chair Hassemer.

**Pete Hassemer** [00:16:54] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah, in response to Christa's list there, I agree with that. You know, the Roadmap was a big one. I wasn't sure. I'm glad you specified that. We don't need to edit anymore. We've got a strategic document that can direct this. I guess this morning in one of our meetings my analogy was it's a roadmap. We've spent enough time exploring our route now let's start the journey, and so we can do that at a later date. In response to the bycatch stuff, I hear what John says. I just have anxiety about how we treat it in this process, in the EFP process. And I'm not sure how it changes, but when I look at the overall goals as stated in the Roadmap. Goal A, support innovation, development of multi-species HMS fishing methods to increase the domestic supply and meet demand. And goal B, support and test fishing practices that have potential to be economically viable and consistent with National Standard 9, which is minimize bycatch to the extent practical. I, at points, I read in here that applying bycatch at the EFP level could constrain the development of these fishing methods that lead to a viable fishery. Bycatch, and especially the protected species, I'm glad John referred back to that, are very important. But the advantage we have is the FIW is composed of people in the industry who do the fishing, who are exploring some of this and helping provide the guidance and know what goes on. And I view the EFP as the mechanism that lets you explore the fishing methodology and make changes in that as you explore it to minimize the bycatch. And I don't want to predispose or limit the EFP process by, I guess maybe that's predisposing what an acceptable bycatch level is in the EFP. Bycatch is extremely important, but we're exploring the development fishing methods and, you know in a real high sense, and again not ignoring it, but an acceptable level of bycatch in an economically fishery is one that does not close the fishery after two months of fishing and close it for multiple years, it's minimizing that. So in relation to that, and I appreciate I think Aja said in with this COP 20 and what we're trying to specify in there, there was reference to the Executive Orders and what we'll take up under D.2, I'm concerned about how we treat EFPs here and making sure that we have a pathway where the Council is always engaged in that process and they come through us. The, you know I'm just going to point out that we have the first report we heard was linking the Roadmap to NOAA's National Seafood Strategy, and that's very good. That's a great document. But we heard, well I don't know when we heard it, there's another seafood strategy, it's the America First Seafood Strategy that's on the block also, and that's the Executive Order restoring American seafood competitiveness. And when Sam Rauch talked about that yesterday I asked the question, what does this mean about expanding EFP approaches? And it's unknown yet. So, you know, we're walking into an area of unknown, we can take it up under D.2 and link some of that to what we have here. But I just want to be careful that as the FIW works forward to figure out what things we would evaluate under the EFPs, I understand the performance metrics and that, but if our process puts constraints on that in exploring viable fisheries, there is still the avenue, and we heard it yesterday, any EFP applicant can go directly to NMFS. And NMFS, Mr. Wulff told us, well they try to come back to us should that happen and work with us, but it's not a necessary step. So we need to keep ourselves in the game and make sure our process moves forward. So sorry that was a long thing, but I just have this anxiety, I understand. But I don't think the fishery participants are going to develop a fishery that's going to put them out of business. They're thinking carefully about this and I, you know, I don't support faith-based management, but I do have faith that they're going to work hard to develop techniques and evaluate it so they can minimize bycatch. And I think we need to be careful. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:23:13] Thank you Pete. Rebecca Lent.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:23:13] Mr. Chair I was going to intervene, but if John has to leave maybe you want to speak first. You're good? I just want to say thank you for that guidance. I think that is good guidance to the FIW, and as we're looking at these bycatch performance we want to make sure we're considering all of the factors. The great news here is that we have already had EFPs that led to an FMP amendment and new gear. We've got EFPs already in place. People out fishing have been for a couple of years, so we're learning from those. We managed to come up with those and get the Council to approve it. And we've got these fresh ones coming on this summer. So we've had a pipeline. We've been doing this. But I think as we look at what we're trying to do in the FIW now, if we're not reinventing the wheel we're continuing this type of work, which so far is bearing some fruit and bringing us in some more fish. But thank you for that guidance.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:24:10] All right, anybody else? Corey Niles.

**Corey Niles** [00:24:13] Thank you. Thanks to the work of the F.I.W. I know some of you are flip-flopping on saying FIW versus F.I.W. But that's what I want to, I think I recognize, I'm starting to understand what Aja says, and I think what part of what she's saying is we can't ignore the NMFS part of this and the Council part of this. And I heard Christa say that you all are going to think about that anyway, so I just want to....those are two things to think of, those are good things to think about. And thanks to all of you on the F.I.W. who have been doing this and looking to become more efficient. And I want to debate John on whether we should authorize a fishery with an EFP or not, but not right now so some other time. But yeah, thank you for all your work on this.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:01] All right, thanks Corey. All right. Anybody else? Rebecca.

**Rebecca Lent** [00:25:08] Before we close out Mr. Chair, I just want to thank Kerry and Katie and the Council for their support on all of this work, and Gilly as well. We made a lot of progress. Thank you.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:25:18] I'm not there yet but I'm getting close. Anyway, so I haven't seen any heads going like this so I think we have consen....I think we've kind of accomplished this. Kerry, just want to go over where we're at here so everybody, so we leave this agenda item understanding that we're good.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:25:40] Yes, I think I can do that. And I didn't type all this that fast. I did have some help from Christa, so thanks for sending me your talking points. So what I'm hearing is consensus to adopt the Terms of Reference that are in FIW Report 1, and she gave rationale for all these. I won't give the rationale. And then direct the FIW to provide COP 20 language in September 2025 under the membership appointments and Council Operating Procedures. And along those lines, there are, in FIW Report 1 I think it is, it outlines three specific sort of tactical changes regarding the timing and the months. But then I also heard discussion and guidance from Christa to consider this option of having applicants apply directly to NMFS with less of a presence in the Council process and I'm anticipating that there would be some pretty specific guidance on that like under specific circumstances that might be appropriate. But then I also heard very clearly that the Council doesn't want to abrogate our responsibility or ability to be involved in EFPs. And then also to task the FIW with developing HMS EFP performance goals and metrics including the acceptable levels of bycatch and economic metrics. Adopt the work plan that is in FIW Report 2.

And prioritize the production of EFP application. So that gets to, you know, trying to sort of standardize and make a facilitate and support the EFP application process to make it lend some clarity and perhaps efficiencies to that. And I know some of the HMSMT members have already been exploring an easier template or application package, so I think that's what we're talking about there. And then finalize the current draft of the Roadmap. So that means I think your guidance was to go ahead and adopt the proposed changes from the FIW that are in the FIW Report 1, its Appendix 2 I think, one of the appendices to that FIW Report 1. And then Christa I think you said, and then bring it back in November for further consideration or approval? Yeah, thank you.

**Christa Svensson** [00:28:37] Yeah, thank you. I have in my component at the November meeting, that is currently shaded on the November meetings, so that there I think is a little bit of flexibility if we end up unshading for November or if the FIW comes back and says, hey, we need a little bit longer. But basically to take that final draft version that we have, meaning adopt the changes that we've currently got and bring that back under that agenda item that we have on the agenda at this point in time. Since I have the microphone, I am going to just make one point on point three because Kerry I didn't hear you speak to that, which was I did have the words about prioritizing around bycatch and economic metrics, so I just don't want it to fall through the cracks in terms of tasking the FIW with developing HMS EFP performance goals that there was the prioritization of those two two items with the consideration of others.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:29:50] Okay, thanks Christa. Okay, well there you go, there's the summary and so we're all good. So I think we're good. So Kerry.

**Kerry Griffin** [00:29:57] Okay, well if there's no further questions or guidance then I guess that concludes your business on this agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:30:05] Well, very good. Well, thank you. Yep I thank everyone. With that, that takes care of our HMS items.



## **G. Habitat Issues**

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

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:00] All right, I don't think there's much Council action here, but I'll open up the floor for discussion as needed. Corey Ridings.

**Corey Ridings** [00:00:11] Thanks Chair. I just wanted to reiterate what Marci said in thanking Dr. Greene for his service. He's always been such a friendly face here, so thoughtful, just really exemplifies kind of excellence in government science. And just wanted to, if he's listening right now just let him know that we miss him and thank him.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:36] Thank you Corey. Yep, well said. All right, anything else? Kerry, how are we doing?

**Kerry Griffin** [00:00:44] I think you're doing just fine. If there's no guidance or other questions from the Council then that concludes your business for this agenda item.

**Brad Pettinger** [00:00:51] Okay. Well, great work everyone we're 11 minutes ahead, so that's good.