

COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
288th Session of the
Pacific Fishery Management Council
June 10-15, 2026
Doubletree by Hilton Spokane City Center
322 North Spokane Falls Court, Spokane, WA 99201

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 Coordinating Committee Meeting Update	6
2. Fiscal Matters.....	11
3. Approve Council Meeting Records	14
4. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures (COP)	15
5. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning.....	20
D. Cross Fishery Management Plan	28
1. National Ocean Service Briefing – Deep Sea Mineral Mining.....	28
2. Marine Planning.....	31
3. Special Project 2: Socioeconomic Framework	33
4. Council and NMFS Workload—Capacity Alignment.....	46
E. Groundfish Management	57
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	57
2. Inseason Management – Final Action.....	61
3. Stock Assessment Process Review and Proposed Process Revisions	63
4. Final Stock Assessment Plan for 2027, Preliminary Priorities for 2029 and Beyond	86
5. Moving Trawl Gear EFP into Regulations; Updating Declaration Requirements; Removing Duplicative Recreational Regulations	93
6. 2027-28 Harvest Specifications, Management Measures, and Exempted Fishing Permits – Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment Final Action.....	98
7. Stock Assessment Terms of Reference for 2027-28.....	108

F. Habitat Issues	114
1. Habitat Issues	114
G. Highly Migratory Species Management	119
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report.....	119
2. International Management	121

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

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] With that, before we begin our business, we've had a detailed agenda, preliminary or draft agenda published in the briefing materials. Look to see if there's any approval of the agenda? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:16] Mr. Chairman, when appropriate, I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:19] Please go ahead.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:22] I move the Council approve the detailed agenda for the 288th session presented in A.3 in the June 2026 briefing book.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:31] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by David Sones. Please speak to your motion.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:35] I think as you just mentioned, we've had a published agenda for quite some time. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:41] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion or discussion on the motion? Seeing none, I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:00:51] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:54] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. We have an agenda we will follow.

B. Open Comment Period

1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items

No transcription for this agenda item.

C. Administrative Matters

1. Council Coordinating Committee Meeting Update

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] Any questions on the report? Rebecca Lent then Jaime Diamond. Rebecca.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:06] Thank you Chair. And thank you Mr. Executive Director for the report. You talked about a lot of things, but one of the things you talked about is something that we hear a lot at the Council, particularly for groundfish, and that's the struggle with markets and getting good prices and having access to markets and competition with foreign imports. And I noted there is a for-info report from the USDA Office of Seafood. The subtitle is, "Serving Farmers of the Seas". When I looked at that, I thought, well maybe only they're, they're only doing aquaculture as they have been doing in the past. But it looks like USDA is expanding some of these programs that involve some promotion opportunities, some risk management, a little bit of financial support. Those are being open to wild fishing, wild stocks, and so I'm wondering if you heard anything from USDA? Were they at the meeting? Did anybody mention it? I just hope that at the Council we can explore some of these opportunities. Thank you.

Merrick Burden [00:01:06] Yeah, I appreciate the question Dr. Lent. That informational report is something that Mr. Pettinger actually had a chance to, I don't know, help draft, but was there for the rollout of that report, and so maybe he's in a better position to answer some of your questions.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:23] Brad, go ahead.

Brad Pettinger [00:01:26] Thank you Chair Hassemer. Yes, I had the honor of representing the West Coast in the rollout of the USDA Seafood Liaison Office in D.C. And it's part of the President's Executive Order on Seafood Competitiveness. And basically what's happened is that fishermen now have equivalency with farmers and all the programs available to farmers, as much as they can, are available to fishermen as far as....not everything fits because USDA has been largely land-based, but all those programs that are applicable to, maybe applicable to fishing and processing and infrastructure, imports, is now available to the seafood industry. So probably one of the biggest things I think in my mind, my last 30 years to support fisheries. So really a great day for fisheries announcement and it's just an honor to represent the West Coast at that event.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:25] Thank you. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:02:29] Well, Miss Lent just stole a little bit of my thunder. I was going to inquire similarly and maybe the ability to elaborate, and maybe it's for Mr. Pettinger, but with the Office of Seafood Creation, I guess, well, you did just say it, what it'll do is just trying to understand better....how, I guess was, will there be crossover or any interaction between the Council and the Office Of Seafood with this new kind of body that has to do with seafood but not necessarily regulatory I'm guessing, but like how does that work? Like will there be overlap or cross work or anything like that with the office, liaising, anything like that? Just how that'll play out? And then one question after that.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:20] All right. First, let me see. I mean, the office is new and I don't know if Mr. Pettinger can add anything else to that or maybe we could look at a future meeting, but Brad is there anything?

Brad Pettinger [00:03:34] I can't really add too much more to that. They've got a person, individual selected to basically run that office. I think it's just at the beginning stages and how it works, how it's going to be applied, I think that's still to be determined, but I know that the Department of Agriculture is very excited about including fisheries, and I think they will be working hard to get that up and going and so those resources will be available to the seafood industry. So thanks.

Jaime Diamond [00:04:07] Okay, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:08] Thank you. Your other question?

Jaime Diamond [00:04:10] Yep. On the Council member development, I kind of looked at that as very different than what we were just talking about. Council member development, more like....is that more professional development opportunities and what, what comes up through that? Does it come....is it some type of opportunity that comes to all Council members to participate in or get some type of learning from or Council member development? Like, I'm just trying to understand what that means?

Merrick Burden [00:04:37] Yeah, thank you. I appreciate that question Miss Diamond. The way to think about the Council Member Ongoing Development is that it is a basically an attempt at continuing what used to be called the Fisheries Sustainability and Leadership Forum, and I'm not sure if you're familiar with that, but it used to be there were a couple of fishery professionals that would bring in Council members, tackle topics, and like develop the capacity of those Council members to address those topics in, you know, good ways. And so that program dissolved, it might be about almost 10 years ago now, and the Councils decided that they really benefited from that, and so we all decided, and I think Chuck before me with some of the other EDs, decided we should try this again. And so we convened, we've had two of them now, the first one was in the large fishing community of Denver, Colorado. But it brought all the Councils together, representatives from the Councils together, usually about three Council members at a time. And one of the facilitators of the fisheries forum is now a private consultant, and so she's been, the facilitator has been brought in to run CMON. And so we had a second one actually in Vancouver last summer and several folks around this table participated in that. I heard some raving reviews. I remember having a long conversation with Aja when I was on the phone out on a walk and she was like, we have to keep doing this. This is great and it's fantastic. And I heard good feedback from the other participants as well. So now we're on the hook for the third one and we still have to come up with a theme. The intention would be to continue with that same facilitator. She's very good. And we'd have to find a location. And so when that starts to come together, I would then send out a expression of interest to you all and see like who's interested in attending. And then if there's a decision that needs to be made about who, like if there are more people than places, we can work through that. But that's still maybe a year away before we get to that process. We still have to figure out a theme. We have to secure the contractor. We have to secure the location, put some logistics in place. So

the plan right now is to do that in 2028. So I believe that's answering your question, but let me know if I've missed something.

Jaime Diamond [00:07:11] Close enough. Thanks, yeah.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:14] Thanks, and yeah, the last one was in Vancouver, Washington, but it was hosted by the North Pacific Council. They just chose a more southerly location to do that. Quick show of hands, who from this table participated in that? So you talk to those folks about what happened there. Aja, did you have something there?

Aja Szumylo [00:07:33] Yeah, I had a question about the meeting if it's okay to move on to that? The CMOD was excellent. I went to a fisheries forum meeting long ago when it was in its previous forum, and it's just the chance for the Council members to get together from other regions. And like yeah, sort of like the new Council member orientation training where you get to like hear different perspectives from other regions and recognize that, oh, we're all doing the same thing in different places and like....yeah, the conversation in particular that I was, I think, talking about with Merrick was I think frustrations about latent ownership with IFQ with the Gulf Council, and we were like tripping over each other like, being like, it's the same! It's horrible! So it's very comforting to hear from people around the country that we're all experiencing the same thing and dealing with really similar issues and there's a lot to learn from each other. My question is about the Executive Order. And I wanted to hear some more characterization of the discussion. I know that the government is moving forward with the USDA Seafood Liaison, that we're making some inroads there connecting across the government, but you'll remember we had that big long discussion about the much broader scope of what would be helpful from trying to enhance seafood competitiveness and like the layers of things that extend beyond just reducing regular, yeah, reducing the number of regulations that we have. And then I've seen around the ether the.....I know that NOAA is working on a contract to support the Councils in work moving forward around implementing things related to the Executive Order now that they've done that call for comments. But the things that I've seen so far have been really limited to what I think are just like the rulemaking things that we all have on our plates and they don't really extend into the areas that I was really hopeful for. So I was wondering if you guys had any discussion about, like, is it going to be better than just helping us get through a couple more rules faster? Is it going to be more comprehensive? Was there any thought about that or is it just going to be kind of more of the same kind of thing?

Merrick Burden [00:10:05] Yeah, I appreciate the question and I appreciate your interest in our, I guess, many people around the table's interest in this topic. I will admit the CCC meeting feels like it was 10 years ago. I don't recall a discussion along the lines of what you're asking, but the administrator, he really stressed the intention of helping the fishing industry in removing obstacles and boosting economic performance and we spent quite a bit of time. We now do like a round robin update through all the Councils, and that was really a focus of all the Council's, like here's what we're doing and here's where we need help. And so that triggered, you know, several conversations throughout the meeting and in the hallways and things like that. I'm struggling to think of an answer to what you're digging at, but I'll look at our Chairman and Vice-Chairman and see if they have any recollection of those conversations.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:02] Thank you. Similarly, we didn't get into some of the topics you're addressing, not that I recall. I mean clearly, and maybe this is just my opinion, but NMFS priorities are the Executive Order and we understand that, and they're our priorities too, but the Council's work extends beyond, and you said the markets, and that expanding that and the opportunities is part of that. A lot of, or most of the discussion was focused on implementation of what the Councils are doing and some, I think it's in the report, recognizing some regional flexibility. I think it's up to this Council to keep pushing that and the others. But it wasn't that overarching discussion because each Council's needs are different in what fisheries they have. So thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:13] Thank you Chair. With this group, and my question is going to....bleeds into some stuff we're talking about under three different agenda items later today, but with the discussion about the deep sea mining issue, was there any discussion about NMFS personnel being reprioritized to that and what we might be losing with those folks now that we're focusing on mining rather than what they had been? Or just any conversation about NMFS, how that might affect NMFS workload? NMFS prioritization?

Pete Hassemer [00:12:53] I'll let the Executive Director chime in, but no, we had an update on the act, which we'll hear again today, but that was very new and I don't recall any discussion about the impacts of that. Thanks. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:13:13] Thanks. My question's about the risk value matrix framework. It sounds like there was some discussion, maybe not totally in depth, but you noted sort of the theme is still there about the need to discuss these things, and I'm wondering, is this coming up again on a CCC agenda? Or is there any additional thoughts about, you know, is that going to be more considered on a Council by Council basis? Just curious if there's anything additional around that we should be thinking about?

Merrick Burden [00:13:40] I appreciate the question Miss Ridings. It was a, I guess I would have to say it was a bit of a challenging conversation, and I think part of that is because of the CCCs members, the Councils, are substantial pushback on that effort. And so I think, I don't want to speak for headquarters, but what I gathered was that they're not sure where to go from here. And they had a plan of sort of helping to organize the various priorities across the country and then align all of NMFS's resources and the Council's perspectives where we need regional priorities, and so we just disagree inherently with this approach. And so there's a large tension between headquarters and the Council perspectives. The conversation, I guess what I meant in my earlier comment, the conversation still needs to happen, right? We have fewer resources at NOAA and how do we keep getting our work done? And so there are a variety of ideas that are at play, like can we borrow scientists from across the country to help for different projects we have here and vice-versa, things of that nature, but they're not organized under this framework, this nationally driven framework that headquarters was leading. What we have been really leaning on and stressing from the Pacific side is the effort that the Council leadership and West Coast NMFS leadership has been taking, and so we'll have an agenda item to talk about that later in this meeting. And I think that has resonated with a lot of other Councils and some of the other Regional Administrators. And so what we're hoping to do at the next meeting is to, and actually our Chairman here made a motion that all the different Councils do as much, that we come back and we say, here's what we're doing at the regional level and here's how we're organizing our priorities

at the Council with the West Coast, in this case, the West Coast Region and Science Center priorities to achieve our work. And so that'll, we hope to sort of shift the momentum to a regional discussion of priorities rather than a national discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:59] Thank you. Other questions? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:16:02] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. Merrick, I hear there was a discussion about SK funding, and I believe there was....wasn't there a vote to increase the SK funding to \$100 million? At the CCC meeting wasn't there a discussion and a vote on that? I'm just curious a little more of the discussion, you know, where that went and what the request was specifically besides beyond the money?

Merrick Burden [00:16:33] Yeah, thanks for that question. And I apologize, I don't have that in my report here. There was interest from two of the Councils, the Gulf and the Western Pacific Council in increasing SK funding, and what they dug into was the start of the whatever law established the SK Program and how that was supposed to be tied, the funding for that was supposed to be tied to tariffs. And as tariff revenue has gone up and up and up the SK funding has remained flat, and so I believe the Western Pacific Council made a motion along the lines of what you're thinking of, but I don't really have the details in front of me, but it was to increase the funding more commensurate with the tariff revenue that's been going up, and then to use that to support the traditional SK programs. So that'll be part of the formal report when it comes out in the next couple of weeks, I can assure you of that, but I don't remember any details beyond those.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:31] Yeah, thank you. We'll make sure we ping you when that report comes out because we can't access the final motions and that until we get the report. So other questions? Not seeing any. Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:48] Not a question, but I think that Aja had a question about what's, as far as the Executive Order, what's going on? And I was back in D.C. for the fish fry last week and I did get a request as far as is there anything else the Council, as far as....like we submitted an ask, I guess, as far as items that we were interested in moving forward, and I was asked if there was anything else? And I think I reached out to Merrick, you know, is there anything else to add to that? And it sounded like to me that there's something, there's a deadline that was going to happen and things will be pushed through to the next level. I'm not sure what that is, but I know that things are moving. So that's all I have. I want to just say that so you know that nothing's static back there. That things are moving through so.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:31] Thank you. Anything else? Not seeing any then we can close out that agenda item.

2. Fiscal Matters

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:01] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Not a question, but when the time is appropriate I have a motion.

Butch Smith [00:00:05] Okay, I see no public comment, is that correct still? I think we're...you have any questions before?

Jaime Diamond [00:00:17] Not question.

Butch Smith [00:00:19] Okay, go ahead.

Jaime Diamond [00:00:20] Okay. I really appreciated the presentation that we got that's in the attachments at the Budget Committee. And when you go through it and see what the different line items are it lays it out really well in the presentation. And the cuts that were made to close the gap of the deficit spending, in 2024 for example, is a deficit of \$760,000 and now it's 348, like that's a big gap to close and that was a lot of work and so I appreciate those that that did that and the work that went into that. And from what I could see it's getting to where it's pretty lean and literally it's the savings are in any time type items. There really isn't like things that are being bought. Staff travel for international things are, that's gone, so then that had a big ticket price to it. Council member or advisory body stipends, that's something that I feel like if there's somewhere we need to add, if someday that we're able to tap in, that's somewhere where I would love to see added because I know that we aren't able to compensate for their time off the water and here and anything we can do to help in that, bolster that someday down the line, a goal of mine would be to put it there. But I know that the staff hiring and using that as a cost savings has been helpful. Working on getting, I mean even the little things, it seems small, but like using the Alaska Travel Code, those little things add up, although in the grand scheme of things it doesn't move the needle too much, but over time it adds up. But I just...I think that taking a good look at things and just really understanding what's going where and how closely and tightly everything is managed folks should be....pay attention to it, understand it, and yeah, just good job. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:02:47] Thank you. Any other questions before we get to Sharon's motion? Or comments? Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:02:57] I said it before and it probably needs to be said again really is that I think the clarity in the materials presented, especially the Executive Director's Report, is just outstanding and really much better than we've seen in the past and so it just really.....it's a very important aspect to be needing to understand it and I think he did a great job doing that so that's it.

Butch Smith [00:03:19] Thank you. All right, Sharon I think you are...

Sharon Kiefer [00:03:36] Mr. Vice-Chairman, I move the Council approves the 2026 calendar year operating budget of \$5,766,822 dollars as recommended in Agenda Item C.2.a, Supplemental Budget Committee Report 1.

Butch Smith [00:03:55] Okay, is that motion that you just put forward correct on the screen?

Sharon Kiefer [00:04:03] Yes sir.

Butch Smith [00:04:04] All righty. Can I get a second? I got Pete, Mr. Chairman. All right, any questions of the motion maker? Seeing none, a little bit of discussion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:04:27] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, just thank you Sharon for the motion. Yeah, like echoing Brad's thanks to staff for the clarity of things. I didn't get my hand up earlier, but this is in support of the motion, but being a member of the Budget Committee for a few years or longer now and going to Jaime's comments, I just want to make the connection to yesterday and what Heather said in the WDFW seat. And it's just one frustration is how do we tell the story of the work that this Council does better and where is the opportunity to do that. So yeah, we're adopting this budget worrying about the structural deficit. Merrick is reminding us cost savings that, and Jaime....but yeah, just wanted to speak to, I hope there's.....people keep looking for that opportunity to tell the story of the work this Council's does, the fisheries it supports, et cetera, et cetera, and that's voting with some frustration that we don't have easier ability to do that but I felt like voicing those comments. So thank you for the motion and definitely in support.

Butch Smith [00:05:32] All right. Sharon, would you like to speak to your motion? I'm sorry I skipped that part.

Sharon Kiefer [00:05:37] Mr. Vice-Chairman, I've noticed the Budget Committee is not an excessive spender. I think it's a very reasonable budget that they have put forth for this Council's consideration and I certainly support it.

Butch Smith [00:05:53] Okay, so any other discussion on the motion? Brad?

Brad Pettinger [00:06:02] I left out Patricia in my thanks and just really what a fantastic job she does. I just really do appreciate her and it's just outstanding so.

Butch Smith [00:06:13] Thank you. We all appreciate Patricia. Any other comments or discussion? Okay, I'll ask for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:06:24] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:06:25] Those opposed? Any abstentions? The motion carries unanimously. Thank you. So Patricia have we done our work? Oh, sorry Merrick. Go ahead.

Merrick Burden [00:06:44] Just one matter just to make sure that we're on the same page is the matter of the September Budget Committee. So unless there's objection I think it is wise to proceed with that, that's our usual course of things. We start talking about the next year's budget in September. So that'll be our plan unless there's some objection. I just wanted to make sure that that's there.

Butch Smith [00:07:09] And then to clarify, after August 14th then Lynn Mattes will be sitting in the Chair's seat. Vice-Chair? Oh, go ahead Pete. Okay, all righty so Patricia have we completed our task?

Patricia Hearing [00:07:26] Yes you have. I look forward to seeing you again in September.

Butch Smith [00:07:30] All righty, thank you. Thank everyone on this matter. Great job.

3. Approve Council Meeting Records

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] We're going to move on to our next administrative matter, C.3, approval of Council meeting records. The March and April 2026 meeting records have been included in the briefing book for your review. Look around and see if there's any discussion or movement to adopt those? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:22] Mr. Chairman, I do have a motion when the time is appropriate.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:28] Let's hear your motion and then we can have discussion.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:35] I move the Council approves the Council meeting records for the 286th, which was the March 2026 meeting, and the 287th, April of 2026 meetings presented an Agenda Item C.3, Attachments 1 and 2.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:52] Thank you. That language appears accurate and complete?

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:55] Yes sir.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:55] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by David Sones. Please speak to your motion as needed.

Sharon Kiefer [00:01:02] The Council has had a chance to review the meeting records. We have not heard objection to those records and thus we should move forward with approval.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:14] All right, thank you. Any questions or discussion regarding the motion? Not seeing any I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:01:24] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:26] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Sharon. That completes our work on that agenda item so we will close it out.

4. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures (COP)

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] There's no public comment so that will take us to our Council tasks. A list of them up there. Number 1 has been completed already in the overview provided by Miss Ames. I just want to add my appreciation to the Council for their vote of confidence for a second term as Chair, and I'm sure Butch Smith extends the same appreciation for his second term as a Vice-Chair. And then take the opportunity to welcome to the leadership team in August Miss Christa Svensson who will be working with us, so thank you all for that. And also welcome the new individuals appointed to, or those newly appointed to serve on the advisory bodies. Thank you for your future service to the Council. Let's go through the rest of those in order. Number 2, any guidance regarding the solicitations? They were listed there. Expecting the Council as they were described to move forward through those. Any discussion to have regarding those? And I don't know if we need the list up there. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:26] Thank you Chair. I'm supportive of the proposal Miss Ames recommended a little bit ago. I know this came up earlier in the week about how we make participation in our Scientific and Statistical Committee attractive. We've got a couple of vacancies, likely some more coming up. How do we make those, helping with the SSC become attractive to more people? I don't have an answer for that, but I do think it is something we need to be considering due to the heavy workload with, even though we just finished groundfish spex yesterday, the stock assessment process starts to ramp up this fall. There'll be a lot of work this summer too for groundfish. There's a lot work for CPS. And the SSC also acknowledged they could use some additional economic support. So hopefully we will put the announcement out keying on those. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:24] Thank you. Any other discussion or thoughts on that? Otherwise I'm going to look to Kelly. The list, we've gone through it, the list is clear and those will be, we will be advertising soliciting applicants for those positions so thank you. Let's move on to the Terms of Reference for the Sacramento River Fall Chinook Workgroup. Any discussion there? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:02:58] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to note my appreciation for Council staff work on the revisions to the TOR. I really like that they've taken an extra step to provide us an explanation for the modifications as they're shown in strikeout underline. I also want to flag the report submitted by the Sacramento work group itself, noting that membership is declining on this committee and it is a....this looks like to be a long term persistent problem, an inability to fill a number of the vacancies on this work group. So other than that I certainly support the modifications as shown. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:48] All right, thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:03:51] Thank you Chair. I feel like I should put the John North tag in front of me at the moment because I'm going to be trying to speak for him here. We agree with Marci. I really thank the Council staff for the work they did in incorporating the guidance earlier this year. Also share concerns about the membership of this group and how we can fill those vacancies as

we make progress. The amended TOR does provide clear and sensible expectations and desirable long term outcomes that seem to be reasonable and achievable. The continued engagement of all involved parties is needed both in developing scientific and innovative approaches to population management as well as the outreach and coordination with stakeholders and the public. So we think this is a good step forward and appreciate the work that's gone into it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:45] Thank you Lynn. Other discussion regarding this? Otherwise I think because of the modifications you have strikeout in clean versions of that before you. We would need a motion to adopt that. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:01] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, I do have a motion and I'll just read it verbally if that's all right. I move the Council adopt...

Pete Hassemer [00:05:21] Let's hang on while they get their screen up there.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:31]The revised Sacramento River Fall Chinook Workgroup Terms of Reference as shown in Agenda Item C.4, Attachment 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:12] And do you want to add June 2026?

Marci Yaremko [00:06:15] Sure. June 2026.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:20] All right, I followed along. The language appears clear and is that accurate and complete?

Marci Yaremko [00:06:25] Yes it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:26] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Jaime Diamond. Please speak to the motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:31] I think the comments made earlier by myself and by Lynn Mattes cover it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:38] All right, thank you. Let me look around. Any questions or discussion regarding the motion? Seeing no hands I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:06:52] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:55] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Okay, back to our list, revisions to Operating Procedure Number 20. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:07:16] Thanks Mr. Chair. I think pointing back to the March Council meeting we discussed the edits that had been proposed by the Fisheries Innovation Workgroup to COP 20. I think we had some good discussions there, and there was a motion in that meeting to move forward with adopting changes to the COP at the next time it was considered, which is now. In the intervening time some of the representatives on the Highly Migratory Species Advisory Subpanel

raised some concerns about proposed changes to Section D, and I really appreciate the work that went on at this meeting between the Enforcement Consultants and highly migratory species advisory bodies to come to some better agreement on that. I think the language for Section D is nearing completion, but it's not there yet. And I think as was pointed out in the trilateral report that the changes should apply across FMPs. It's one of those things that very clearly all COPs that address EFP work needs to have the same language with regard to how the Council is considering enforcement actions against potential EFP holders. So I think it's good to hold back on that at this time, but move forward with other changes. And when we're ready I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:49] All right, let me look around real quick. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:08:52] Thank you Vice-Chair. And now I'm going to channel Mr. Ainsworth...(laughter)....But we concur with Mr. Ugoretz's recommendations there that we're not quite ready for prime time and really appreciate the joint communication and report from the triumvirate. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:13] Thank you. Not seeing any other hands, John I think we're ready for your motion.

John Ugoretz [00:09:24] I'll wait for it to show on the screen. Ooh look at that. Okay, well the hyperlink sort of un-hyperlinked itself, but I move that the Council adopt edits to Council Operating Procedure 20 found in Agenda Item C.4, Attachment 3, with the exception of edits to Section D, Other Considerations. I also move that the Council direct staff and the Enforcement Consultants to work with NOAA Fisheries and Office of Law Enforcement to review language found in any Council Operating Procedure that addresses the impact of enforcement actions on the approval of Exempted Fishing Permits, and develop proposed changes to make the procedures consistent and reflective of current practice.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:26] Thank you. I followed along. What you said does appear on the screen including some hyperlink language to that report so everything's accurate and complete?

John Ugoretz [00:10:38] Everything's accurate. I'm not going to read the whole hyperlink, but it is C.4, Attachment 3 that I'm referencing.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:45] Yes, thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

John Ugoretz [00:10:51] Thank you. I think as I just noted, doing the edits to Section D more comprehensively makes sense. I would suggest that when NOAA and staff and our Enforcement Consultants are looking at these changes that they carefully review all COP's that have this sort of reference as well as salmon which doesn't have this reference. And I would also ask that they really consider including something in the COPs about timing. Right now the way they're written it looks like the Council is making this sort of determination during the EFP process. What currently happens, to my knowledge, is that once the Council refers an EFP to NOAA, then enforcement is asked about the enforcement history of an applicant. I think that's the appropriate procedure for NOAA to be working with the enforcement agencies. However, it might be more appropriate for

that sort of review to occur before the Council receives a proposed EFP, because we are investing lots of staff and Council time and effort on reviewing EFPs, but if the individual is not going to be able to be permitted by NOAA then I don't think we should waste our time on it. I'm not suggesting we make any decision about that right now, but I want the agency and staff and Enforcement Consultants to consider it. And so with that, I think my motion can accomplish that.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:38] Thank you. Any questions on the motion or discussion regarding the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:48] Thank you Chair, and thank you Mr. Ugoretz for the motion. There's been mention of having Enforcement Consultants weigh-in on this discussion. I'm hoping that the appropriate advisory bodies would be as well, have the GMT and GAP for groundfish and CPS folks too. So I'm seeing a head nod. I just want to make sure that they have the opportunity as well to review this. It's part of their process. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:16] John.

John Ugoretz [00:13:18] Yeah, thanks, and through the Chair, I think my intent would be that we get some draft language based on the input that's been received to date and the discussions that occur with NOAA. And then obviously when this comes back as draft language, it should be reviewed by all affected advisory bodies, which hasn't occurred yet. It's another reason to not do this right now.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:47] All right, thank you. Any other discussion? Chris German.

Chris German [00:13:53] Thank you Mr. Chair. And that was our intent when we were having that discussion and why we did not include salmon. But the intent going forward from the EC and the HMS ABs was to broaden this and include everyone else in that discussion so we're not making decisions on their behalf so.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:12] Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:14:13] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. The last motion we actually added the 2026 to the motion. It was in the hyperlink, but I just, do we want for clarity, just want to make sure we add 2026 to there so? I mean, it's not a big deal, but we did it the last motion and probably should just add this to this one just because, or not.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:41] Yes, I'm going to use my powers here to say I believe John read that and he did not read the hyperlink, which was in there has now been removed so this is accurate. Thank you. Other discussion? Seeing no hands then I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:15:08] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:11] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank You John. All right let's look back to our list and check in with Miss Ames. Kelly, is there more to do?

Kelly Ames [00:15:29] Thank you Mr. Chair, Council members. You have completed your work here. You have elected new Council officers, made appointments to Council advisory bodies, and provided guidance on our upcoming solicitations. Per the motion from Miss Yaremko, you also have adopted the revised Sacramento Fall Chinook Terms of Reference. And then lastly, we have a motion that encouraged us, and we will work with the Enforcement Consultants Office of Law Enforcement and NOAA Fisheries on preparing revised language for the EFP, the COPs for EFPs in Section D. We'll bring that forward for consideration at a future meeting by all advisory bodies and the Council. We would also have a look at the COP that governs the salmon test fisheries. And then in addition, you adopted the remaining proposed changes to COP 20, which you had adopted at the March Council meeting. So quite a lot of work here accomplished this morning in a short amount of time. And you have completed the tasks under this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:40] All right, thank you. I'll look around and make sure I haven't missed anything. But not seeing any hands then we'll close out this agenda item.

5. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, takes us to public comment. There is no sign up. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:09] Thank you Chair. Sorry to interrupt at this point, but I just want to note that the November Council meeting is the biggest meeting for HMS, about 7 hours total floor time. We've got the HMS Advisory Panel and Management Team coming, but just for 2 days and that's on day 2 and day 3. I hope I'm not out of order here. I can tell by your perplexed look that maybe I can't talk about November. Can I?

Pete Hassemer [00:00:35] Well, we're going to go into discussion so we'll go through September, November, Year-At-a-Glance, if you want to start there?

Rebecca Lent [00:00:46] Well, I'll just stop there and then just say that I think that those two advisory bodies could use an extra day. And thank you for letting me talk out of turn.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:56] No, this is discussion. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:02] Thank you Chair. I appreciate the Executive Director's Report about Council staff. I think it would be shocking if all of us produced something like that about what Council takes. This is a very time-intense process, even for those of us who this is part of our job, especially for those who aren't, so do appreciate putting that in context. As happenstance, I was working on my timesheet this morning and for last week I'm at 154%. And today is day 2 of my work week, and I'm going to be at 80% at the end of day 2. Not trying to belittle anything that the Council staff does, they do great. They have a hard job wrangling our advisory bodies and helping them provide statements, but just want to acknowledge that all of us put a lot of time and effort into this. It takes away from families, et cetera. So trying to be efficient in what we do is admirable, but we always have more work than we have load as I tend to say. With that being said, appreciate what Dr. Lent said about the HMS folks in November requesting an extra day. Also I'm hoping that Council staff, Council leadership can work with the GMT and GAP leadership. I know they can't be in-person, but given the workload, maybe they can have a day or two remote during the September meeting so that they have additional time to work together and work with each other while we're working on things. I know remote isn't ideal, it doesn't provide that face-to-face communication, and it is a work and technology load for Council staff, I do want to acknowledge that. But hoping we can.....I just don't think they're going to be able to take care of everything in a half-day or a full-day webinar 10 days a week before the meeting, so would like to see if we can honor that request. And then one final thing, I think there's a CPS meeting in late July. I forgot to mention it under the COPs and memberships. We have asked to have Mr. Christian Heath fill the vacant ODFW seat on the CPSMT for that meeting, just so that there's somebody who is familiar with Oregon data as we work on hiring that position. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:36] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:03:40] Thanks. Also following up on the ED Report on staffing. Just looking at how much time we spend on groundfish. I know that's not new news and how many resources we're spending, but I do want to address that I get the Council's responsibility to have fairness between our states, that's in the National Standards, and also making sure that we are serving all of our fisheries and fishermen and fishing communities. And so that for me continues to raise flags and just forces some introspection about how we're thinking about CPS, HMS, salmon, and even ecosystem as an item that serves all of our FMPs. Also, I just wanted to note clearly most of the Council staff is working over 100% of their time and I'll just echo what Lynn said, I'd just like to thank them. This has been said before. Their work and their commitment is amazing. I think it should be a Council goal to get them to 100%. I don't think that we should continue to ask them to work more than 100%. And so I thank our....I thank Director Burden. I appreciate this report and also your management. I think is the Council's job to also help you get those folks to 100% so if there are ways the Council can help you do that, I would like to be part of that. So echoing a couple thoughts that came out of the report. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:16] Thank you. Other discussion regarding what we've heard here? And these....if there are not I'm going to turn to Executive Director Burden. I guess, well, while you think about that I do have a question. It's something I guess I haven't thought about and it relates to the question Miss Yaremko asked about that methodology review the, I need to pull it up here, the SSC request was adding in the eDNA part. And then there was a request, and how do items get put on that methodology review? Is that agenda already set in stone or is there deliberation of who sets that and what happens? And I'm not sure who to ask that? Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:06:20] Yeah, sure. We....let's see methodology reviews, each FMP does things a little bit differently. So when it comes to the groundfish methodology reviews, we are I think fairly flexible with the SSC in trying to identify topics that are sensible and can help advance, you know, the science that supports this Council's decision-making. So we usually don't bring an agenda item to you and ask you to make a motion to adopt topics for methodology review and groundfish. It's more about awareness and we have a dialogue like we're having now. So, I don't know, Kelly, if you want to add anything to that, but I think it's.....short answer is, I think it's fully appropriate to consider that here. and I would say, unless you have objection to it, I think it's easy for us to fold that into the methodology review meeting. Do you have anything to add to that Kelly?

Kelly Ames [00:07:23] Through the Chair, yes, thank you Executive Director Burden. I would also just note that we do have on the November agenda item, you know, the sequence for groundfish. We have our methodology review agenda item here. We would be prepared to adopt final methods for use in stock assessment for the upcoming year, but it is where we also select improvements, methodology improvements for our impact projection models. So there is a process. My read of this widow rockfish recommendation is that it would influence the stock assessment, and so we would want to make sure that that workshop was held in a timely manner to inform the next review period. So if guidance is needed now in order to make that happen, that would be appropriate.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:19] Yes, thank you. And I'm not sure it's guidance or anything. When I saw that, what triggered some of my thinking was at the CCC meeting their science update on some of their major recommendations for the short term, one of those was to prioritize strategic new hires

with skills in data sciences, genomics, and advanced technology. And I thought this maybe fell in that genomics category. And it's emerging science and not aware of what's going on in there. I think it's appropriate for them to review that if it's moving forward and there are things that I see on the greater NMFS and Science Center front also approaching that so I just thought it was appropriate. Thanks. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:09:15] Apologies for speaking up again Chair Hassemer. I think Rebecca started to get at it, or Dr. Lent started to at it, but it was brought up in the Oregon Delegation meeting this morning, while there is no HMSAS or MT Report under this agenda item, the HMS folks in the Oregon Delegation this morning were requesting that additional day in November. So while Dr. Lent kind of hinted at it, I just wanted to get that request officially in the record and on the floor just to help those folks get....have a little additional time if possible to complete their work and provide the Council the feedback that they need. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:56] All right, thanks. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:09:57] Yeah, thanks. Just want to also jump in on that one and agree that the HMS Management Team and Advisory Subpanel could probably use an extra day in November. They've got one of their bigger agendas that they've had in a long time and some meaty items that they're going to have to advise us on.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:19] All right, thanks. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:10:23] Sorry, thanks Mr. Chair. Sorry, I've kind of lost the plan here. Are we just saying anything that's germane to the topic, or is it a plan, are we almost done? I had some thoughts but....I'm going November, whatever, so the methodology stuff, is it.....can you just....what are we talking about that's on the floor?

Pete Hassemer [00:10:42] Sure, we've had a lot.....we've heard our advisory body and management team reports, got some input on that, what they'd like to see the Executive Director review those, get your thoughts on that, and then I'm going to turn it over to him, find out what we've heard in terms of adjusting those agendas based on the input. So if you have input regarding that, that's fine, or if you want to wait.

Corey Niles [00:11:14] I will wait. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:16] Okay, so then Merrick.....oh, let's...let me go to John Ugoretz first.

John Ugoretz [00:11:20] Sorry, yeah I think we're all a little off kilter on where we are today, but for the Year-At-a-Glance right now there is no mention of an important update to the Highly Migratory Species FMP. We have to become in compliance with federal law to sunset the DGN fishery. Obviously if we are going to conduct an FMP amendment that's going to take some some work and planning on the agendas. However, I think, and I mentioned this yesterday, there might be a more administrative way to accomplish that. And I know, or at least I'm hoping that National Marine Fisheries Service is looking into a way to accomplish that and maybe could update us moving forward without changing the YAG right now.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:15] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:12:17] Yeah, thank you Chair. And thanks John for the point. Yeah, NMFS is looking into this issue to see if we really had need, a multiple meeting slash Council process on this, given its legislatively mandated and there's no real range of alternative to be considered here. So we'll report back in either September or November of whether, hopefully the former, whether NMFS can do this under our general rulemaking authority and therefore not have to agendize it for any future Council meetings. And so we're planning to present on that at probably the next workload planning discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:54] Okay, so I'm hearing that it's a Year-At-a-Glance and it's not necessary to get it now, but it's on our radar screen. Okay, further input? Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:07] Yeah, I just want to make sure that the conversation with Sarah Nayani is captured somehow. I heard her say that the GAP isn't requesting an agenda item per se related to shortspine discard mortality, but I just want to acknowledge. I thought the thinking from Dr. Johnson about consulting with Council staff about the appropriateness of, or possibility of fitting that into the methods review, it's certainly something that, you know, I'd just like a conversation to happen. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:45] Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:13:47] Through the Chair, yes Miss Yaremko. Just a point of clarification here. So historically when we update those discard mortality rates, it's a task to the GMT to bring together all of the research on discard mortality, the studies. The GMT makes a recommendation about what they think those values should be. It is reviewed by the SSC and adopted by the Council. So I'm just curious, based on, you know having a better understanding of that process, is that something you're tasking the GMT with right now? Or would you like to maybe hear a report from the GMT later about their ability to take on that workload and at what time that could be appropriate?

Marci Yaremko [00:14:31] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you very much Kelly for the reminder about the process and that we do have an established process on how the rates are determined and by who. I like the suggestion of hearing from the GMT. I'd appreciate that. I also am cognizant of their workload and the fact that they're already feeling strapped with regard to statement production. So with regard to timing, flexible. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:05] All right, thank you. Corey Ridings, then Corey Niles.

Corey Ridings [00:15:12] Thanks. Yeah, I.....regarding the EWG Report, I appreciate that their request was moved for their meeting from September into March so that they could cover that in-person. As part....I'm not sure, I don't know if this needs to be an additional agenda item or it could exist under the underlying initiative for update FEP, which is just to take a look at how the special projects work that the Council is doing, crosswalks with the initiatives that are in the FEP Appendix. So just because we're not going to talk about them until March and they're not going to have a chance to be here until March, just wanted to put that out now.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:55] Okay. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:15:59] Thanks. These are part of the thoughts. I was going to say it for later, but I think they fit with what Marci and Corey just said. But I was in the back row here yesterday on the agenda item about NMFS and Council staff workload and thinking that that was nothing, that was not a new challenge, that we do it all the time and we do it often in this agenda item. But this is where it takes discipline, and I think Marci just kind of hit on it of all these. We used to get, and still do get, here's a new idea that comes in this agenda item. Does it jump the queue? Well, it's just an example of how we need to....if we're going to actually have to make hard choices. We've always made....this Council's always made hard choices, but this place has to be tight and structured and I don't know how you do that. But, and also I just....we had a really thoughtful discussion this morning in our 7 a.m. delegation meetings, which I might get to later, but yeah and the GMT and GAP and about, you know, if we're not going to be there in September and there's 10 agenda items that we want to comment on, you know, what's what's the deal there? And so I think we've tried to do it in the past, and it's not hard, but we might have to think hard about where we want the GMT and GAP to spend their time. Like where the distinctive parts of bringing those groups together most valuable? Where could those individuals on those teams work through their agencies? So there's just some overarching thoughts on, yeah, it's coming back everyone, but we have 10 statements, but the whole plan was to downsize on what groundfish people commented on in September, for example. So these are more overarching thoughts, but I'm seeing it come out from this and kind of get disjointed at times in this agenda item. But yeah, I just want to draw that connection to yesterday and some of the things we heard this morning and just going back to yesterday of how do we make those hard choices and do we really need everyone to comment on everything or are we going to....it would be a luxury, but do we have to focus people where we think the GMT, GAP, and all of the advisor bodies are really going to matter most?

Pete Hassemer [00:18:16] Thank you. Any other input here before I ask Executive Director Burden to pull that all together and summarize? Merrick, why don't you report to us.

Merrick Burden [00:18:35] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And I was just listening intently while you all were talking. So I made note of a couple of things. Let's see, looking at the Year-At-a-Glance, what I made note of was the FMP amendment on HMS that we will need to pick up at some point. I'm optimistic, as Ryan is, that maybe this is just a one meeting simple process since it's been legislatively mandated already, so I've just jotted that down for June of 27' for this point, at this point. But putting it down to make sure we don't skip over it. Let's see, I made another couple of notes to myself. So we'll look into adding a day for the HMSAS and MT. That will depend on the nature of our hotel contract, and we are quite full already but we'll look into that. Let's see, I also made note of the GMT and the GAPs concerns about being able to provide you with appropriate and adequate statements in September, so we'll into some online functionality and try to schedule that as soon as we can so that people can hold that time on their calendars. Thinking about the shortspine discard mortality, or a shortspine discard issue, we can huddle some more as staff, but I would suggest that we have the GMT think about this and then we'll bring it back under their workload and new management measures process, which is in March. That's a little bit of time away from now, but GMT is quite full and I think it's best if we see projects through, let them finish their work rather than jumping the queue, and maybe pushing something off of that list that would inadvertently happen if something jumps the queue. So that's what's on

my mind now, but we can talk some more about this as staff. And then Miss Ridings asked about a crosswalk between the FEP Appendix and the IRA projects. We've done some of that already internally. I think we could just do that. I don't think we need an agenda topic or anything, but I think we can do that pretty clearly. Let's see, and then a couple other ideas that I didn't put down for scheduling purposes, but just I think some of you are putting some markers down about conversations you want to have at some point at some time, like Mr. Niles' recent comment. So, in terms of scheduling that's what I've made note of. Let me know if I've missed anything that you think needs to be added to our schedule here, especially over the next 2 meetings.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:20] Any comments, questions regarding that? Not seeing any, again, we'll look at the November QR again in September and have a chance, but September is getting quite firmed up there. So I'm not seeing anything. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:21:48] Apologies, I was going to jump the gun to November, but I'll hold off.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:52] No, go ahead.

Corey Niles [00:21:54] Sorry Merrick, were you going to recap November? Or was that, that was recapping both, both meetings? Okay, sorry. Yeah, I guess to try to keep it somewhat brief, and this is really kind of how I've been filtering out, but we're really looking forward to the risk management discussion in groundfish, and you heard Heather ask about the widow rockfish question to the SSC in that workshop. I'm thinking, I just wonder how really important how to set that up. And I don't know if Aja wants to add anything from our 7 a.m. meeting this morning, but there is.....people in Washington and probably elsewhere, are really wanting almost to just pause everything, like pause the spex for next time to start taking up some of these fundamental issues. And I think you're going to hear some, hopefully going to hear more specifics from us in September, maybe not on that, not pausing everything, but the plan for how to really start fixing things and stop just tweaking process and repeating the same process over and over again and be too busy to take on some of these bigger issues. So I'm also looking at the....so really Merrick and Council members, we're really just drawing emphasis to that risk management discussion that's pending and really spending time before we get there trying to shape that up and take these various issues that we had the stock assessment evaluation as part of it at this meeting where we have, you know, three different places we can go. So, I think I might just, well I'll end by saying, yeah, we have this SSC Review, which I had the opportunity to bug Jessi about on the harvest specifications flexibilities, and I'm really seeing that the only piece of that that's really going to matter much is the green light, and we're asking the SSC to review that in September, the whole thing. And should we instead really be asking them to start thinking about planning out what they said yesterday about widow rockfish and what Heather had a exchange with Galen on about they hadn't got to the planning yet, but really it's that yesterday they told us they didn't do anything more flexible with widow than they did because they hadn't analyzed it enough to know whether it was, you know, safe or not. And so really they're like if you would like us to do that, we would like to plan.....do some analyses and then plan a workshop. So I'm going on longer than habit. So really just voicing like that's, if that's going to start November hopefully, or and there's this discussion in September with the SSC, hopefully we can start thinking about those bigger fixes rather than these smaller, smaller short term fixes as well. And we had discussions numerous times this week about how you balance those two things, the short term and then planning out the long term. Yeah, and we really,

and Aja correct me if I'm going too far here, but we do think that should be a focus. And again, going back to yesterday's, let's focus on the key core things that have the most benefit.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:15] Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:25:16] Thank you. I think Corey said that all well. The other plug is that we said it several times during this meeting that there are a number of different actions that all connect that we're thinking about for groundfish right now that play into each other and then play into that longer view of like how to change the fishery altogether. But I see, I don't see anything but us discussing. But the way that this is set up is for us to take final.....like go through the Council process for things like go through it the normal way where we, yeah, set up PPA, yeah, range of alternatives, PPA, FPA, like we're all.....we're breaking this very complex project out over a number of different individual actions. And I felt at this meeting making motions on the response from Lynker, but then that tied into the Terms of Reference, but then some of those things will also shift into connection to risk management. So I don't have a thought for what to do about it but I just wanted to flag that like I see this coming with groundfish where we are.....I don't want to trip over ourselves, I want to do something productive and I....but I think we need....we need some space to step back to be able to make the picture fit together well so that we're not just patching the system over and over again. So I didn't....you know I kept trying to think about how to comment about that in terms of the upcoming things that are happening in the Year-At-a-Glance. I do see that we have final action on spex flex coming up in November. We've got risk management scheduled for that time as well. We're in an early point in the machinery for spex for the upcoming biennium. But I would hate to leave all of that with something that isn't a cohesive picture about the change that I think needs to happen to get to what we were trying to deal with with what happened with widow and what we're trying to solve with all the actions that we're trying to put together. So I echo everything that Corey said. Just a call for is there a way to step back? Is there a way to think about....I don't know that we can accomplish this like inside the confines of a Council meeting necessarily, or even in the shape that our advisory body system moves through things to consider things for us for Council meetings. So I want to help and I just want to say, like I think a lot of us around the table are like, gosh, I would like to dig in and do more on this. I know that there's interest in the Washington Delegation too as well, that was the focus of our conversation this morning. But I just want to make sure that we don't miss this chance that we have to make things better. And I'm so, so worried that our normal process is going to get in our way because it is cumbersome. So not necessarily looking for an answer for that. I just wanted to get the thoughts out there.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:22] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:28:25] Yeah, thank you. And as I was listening to the two of you I was....I felt like I was looking into a mirror. I was like we're trying to do a lot of things and how are we going to do it? And if what the two of you are talking about is fundamentally changing some of the ways in which we do things, that's what a Committee-of-the-Whole meeting is for, right? So we would get everyone together and we would relax the rules of our usual Council meeting and we'd debate, right, and have conversations about what to do and that can be really healthy. That also takes a lot more work to put those together. So we are in a place where if we want to make headway we have to roll up our sleeves and work hard. And so it's an upfront cost to get there. So

that's just some overarching thoughts. Beyond that, yeah, I guess I would just need more specificity at some point about what the two of you really would like to do? I thought I heard Corey mention like, you spend a lot of time on spex, which is true. Like with....Todd will wrap up this spex process and I think tomorrow he'll start the next one, right? So it's a lot of work, a lot constant churn. I think that's what the 2 of you are getting at. Like, how can we get ourselves out from underneath some of that?

Pete Hassemer [00:29:50] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:29:53] Thanks. Well, there is maybe that bigger part. And to me, it wasn't me saying stop the spex, but people were going there. But more narrowly, I think that risk management, like the agenda item that starts in November, could be an umbrella to start talking about this. And the thing I forgot to say was that in September of last year we, the Council passed a motion that included asking the SSC to consider a multi-year overfishing evaluation way to do that, like multi-year overfishing. So like getting that piece and some of these other big questions about that are causing all the concerns with stock assessments and how we respond to them, that's more of a narrow specific topic that I hope that requesting that you and others spend time thinking about how to set that up for....I hate, I do not like the term set up for success, or however it goes, but let's do that for November was the main pitch. But yeah, I didn't want to lose that inside of the bigger picture of things that you and Aja just talked about, about how we might do things differently.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:05] Thank you. Other discussion? Not seeing any, so you know my comment is we've got another workload planning session in September that's right now scheduled as a five-hour day. Pay attention when you make your reservations to leave that meeting so not knowing how long it goes. So Merrick, is there more to cover here?

Merrick Burden [00:31:39] I appreciate the discussion. I'm just looking Kelly's way quickly to see if she has any questions about anything? But if not I think this is a successful agenda item and we may be done, but Kelly's nodding, so I think you're done with your task. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:59] That completes that agenda item, so we'll close out.

D. Cross Fishery Management Plan

1. National Ocean Service Briefing – Deep Sea Mineral Mining

Butch Smith [00:00:00] And now we are in Council discussion. If you've thought of any other questions that you might ask Dr. Cole, I think he's hanging around for us. So anyway, I got Sharon Keifer. How are you doing?

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:14] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Dr. Cole, I just....given that DSHMRA has actually advanced a process for commercial recovery and permitting for that, and given that the International Seabed Authority has not, and given that the definition of a U.S. citizen under DSHMRA is somewhat broad, do you, and this is speculative I admit it, but do you anticipate that entities who are operating currently with ISA, the International Seabed Authority, may look for opportunities to qualify with U.S. entities to take advantage of the fact that obviously DSHMRA has progressed further in terms of commercial recovery?

Bryan Cole [00:01:13] Yeah, thank you. And yes, we've already seen that. So the applications that NOAA has made publicly available and solicited public comment on include the Metals Company, which is a current exploration license-holder under the ISA and applied under DSHMRA to explore and do commercial recovery of their ISA areas.

Sharon Kiefer [00:01:58] Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:02:00] And real quick, I overstepped my bounds, there is...I didn't see any public comment and we have no public comment. So anyway, I'm sorry I didn't voice that. Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:02:17] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And just a quick question. Are there potential deep sea bed mining area potential in either the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic? And if so, are you consulting with the U.S. fishery managers? In this case, it would be the Secretary who manages those HMS fisheries. Thank you.

Bryan Cole [00:02:39] Was that for me? For Bryan?

Butch Smith [00:02:43] Yes sir. It's for you.

Bryan Cole [00:02:44] Okay, yeah, there are.....there's evidence of nodules in the Atlantic in a small area. I don't believe there's much in the gulf. Yeah, the gulf is not quite the right environment for this sort of stuff to form, and much of it is in the EEZ of a country anyway. So there is an area, if you look at slide 4, you can see there's a ferromanganese nodule area off the East Coast of the United States that could be an area for potential DSHMRA-based licensing or permitting, however we have not yet seen any indication that those are coming our way. There has been interest inside the EEZ, and again this is not my area, but I know a couple of months ago BOEM opened up a applicant or a, I don't even know what to call it exactly, but a company requested that they open up a lease for heavy mineral sands dredging off the coast of Virginia. Does that answer your question?

Butch Smith [00:04:23] All righty. So we've got some Council tasks. Merrick, I think I'll call on you. You have some words of wisdom before we get started here?

Merrick Burden [00:04:36] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. And just want to also thank Dr. Cole for joining us. This has been very informative. Just in the interest of making sure we're on the same page about the action here, this is obviously an item that's of great interest to some of you, but there is no ask of the Council at this point. And so where I believe we're at is that we have several committees and members that are passionate about this issue, and there's a little question that we will be monitoring this. As we move forward we may get a formal request from the consultation side, and Dr. Cole's presentation identified a couple of pathways for how that could work. So I think that the next step forward here is for us to monitor and be ready to respond in this consultation request if it does come forward. Beyond that, I'm not really sure what else there is for the Council to do at this point. I will look at Miss Bernaus and see if she has anything else to add, but I believe that's where we're at Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Butch Smith [00:05:37] Thank you. Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:42] Yeah, just listening to this presentation and discussion, I've been involved in submarine fiber optic cable installations along the coast here and use of ROVs and I'm looking at the....you operate at 3-4,000 meters industrial ROV, just the challenges associated with that. It might be more expensive to go to the moon but it's not as expensive as what they're about doing here in my opinion. I mean this is....I think the technological challenges here are immense and I don't think you're going to see one of these on every street corner as far as these operations. I would be more concerned internationally with some more rudimentary methods of extraction besides what we're seeing here, and I think that what really challenges us is probably more from other countries than what we are going to be seeing operating under the umbrella of this country so.

Butch Smith [00:06:45] Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:06:47] Thanks. Dr. Cole I just wanted to thank you again for providing this presentation and coming here. In light of sort of what we've learned today it sounds like of the 8 Fishery Management Councils, this is probably the one with the most or heavy possible impacts that will be coming down the pike. I realize that you are not required, but it would be, I think, or at least I would appreciate any efforts that you can do to come back to us with updates about how this is moving forward. I realize that we have a special place in the process as part of the EAS at that point, but if there is movement before then, if there's any updates around the applicants, more applicants, what's this looking like? Or if you need information any updates from you would be appreciated. There's many places on the Council agenda that can happen and our amazing Council staff can point you to that at any point in time. So again, just voicing my appreciation and requesting updates as they become available and you're able to keep the Council updated on it. Thanks.

Bryan Cole [00:07:57] Yeah, happy to do so, and thank you. Certainly my intention and hope is to have a open line of communication with you and others that have knowledge and expertise in this area. So happy to come back and keep you up to date.

Butch Smith [00:08:17] And I also think the Habitat Committee will be keeping us informed. And also any other.....Pete, or Mr. Chairman.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:29] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I support what Miss Ridings just said, updates there. And I just encourage our partners, National Marine Fisheries Service, to watch out for opportunities to include the Council, not that we need a lot of work always, but in reading the Deep Sea Mining Act, it's a little vague as to how the Councils might interact. I was pleased to see in the presentation that we had where comment opportunities for the Councils are provided but it's not required anywhere, so just they keep an eye out and at the appropriate time before it's too late the Councils have an opportunity to comment, provide information. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:09:22] Thank you. Any other....Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:27] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, on that similar point, looking at the presentation and the consultation requirement under DSHMRA, the note that was highlighted by the HMSAS that it isn't clear who makes the determination about whether activities could adversely affect any fishery within the EEZ. So there's lack of clarity there. I think we would rather there be an expectation that an activity could affect a fishery rather than an assumption made that an activity would not affect fisheries in our EEZ. So I think I'm interested in learning more about those determinations and who makes them and if we are able to provide our input on that decision. Thank you.

Bryan Cole [00:10:42] Yeah, so I did a little digging while after I spoke and the determination of significant impact is, under NEPA, is made at the discretion and at NOAA's expert judgment. So we will take into account the extent of the impacts and ultimately the decision as to whether it rises to be a significant impact or not is the final authority with that rest of NOAA.

Marci Yaremko [00:11:23] Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:11:28] All right, seeing no other hands, I guess I would look towards Katrina to figure out if we have enough to go on and have done our due diligence on this topic?

Katrina Bernaus [00:11:42] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And thank you again Dr. Cole for being here. The Council has had a good discussion on this topic and you've completed your business on this agenda item.

Bryan Cole [00:11:56] Thank you all.

Butch Smith [00:11:58] Thank you.

2. Marine Planning

Butch Smith [00:00:00] All righty, so we've come to Council discussion. Anything to discuss? Jaime.

Jaime Diamond [00:00:14] I was just going to flag, Miss Schumann did submit a written version of her comments, so since we aren't able to...we have technical difficulties at least it is captured there.

Butch Smith [00:00:29] Okay. The task at hand is provide guidance for future comment opportunities. Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:00:45] Thanks. Yeah, just again, thank the MPC and the GAP for weighing-in on this. We've got a lot of things on the dashboard here and it's great to know that we have a group of folks keeping their eyes on it and keeping us apprised. I would just endorse all the asks that were made in the MPC Report. Ask them to continue monitoring and any letters that might be appropriate for us to write, whether that's quick response or not. And definitely support having a PacFEM briefing or whatever sort of Council staff feels is most appropriate there. That seems like a very useful tool. Thinking about that from a variety of fisheries and the ecosystem lens, I think that sounds like a useful thing that the Council could definitely benefit from. And I also in part endorse the idea of a template, anything that's going to make folks lives easier, faster, I think. Happy to move that forward as a concept to develop with Council staff.

Butch Smith [00:01:49] Thank you Corey. Anyone else? Oh, Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:55] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, I would echo Corey's comments in supporting the MPC recommendations that they've made for us here today. Speaking on the topic of a standing MPC agenda item in June, November, and March, I think that's a good idea. I think that's about right. I think a lot changes month to month. And if I think back just, you know, three, four months ago, the subjects were different, and so a lot changes very quickly in a short period of time. I just can't say enough about the commitment that they are making to keep track of all of these events going in the background. It is really a remarkable undertaking that they're following along all the various processes and the pieces of each item along the way. So I think the template idea with comment letters will certainly help expedite development of letters at least from this Council members perspective. I appreciate their willingness to develop letters on quick timelines and produce letters for us to consider using our quick response process. I know sometimes there's not a lot of time and we continue to see our comment periods shorten or go away entirely, so whatever they can do in advance to prepare so that we'll have the lead time we need to complete the quick response process as the need arises. So thank you again.

Butch Smith [00:03:52] Thank you Marci. And I thought I....Jaime, did you? Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:03:55] Thank you, I echo what Corey and Marci already said. And just a lot of these issues are taking place in Southern California. Several of them like the Ocean Rainforest proposal for kelp, as well as the fracking of Platform Gilda are happening within a few miles of

each other. And these multiple possibly problematic things are coming up and so I appreciate that all these things are being tracked. How this mining may affect our HMS as they come through on their way over to through Southern California and then up the coast, it's concerning and would have a huge impact on recreational fishing as well, not just commercial, but the recreational industry, and so I appreciate that they are keeping an eye on that. I would support the recommendations. I believe one of the things was in the report was a briefing on PacFEM and how that works, and I think there was maybe even a part where it was like maybe they could brief the Council. I wasn't sure if it was briefing the Council or briefing the MPC further on it, but I think it's a useful tool, although I think it is....it's more commercially minded, but I won't be too offended by that..(laughter).., that it has no recreational, not a lot of recreational use in it, but still a useful tool. And then yeah, I definitely support the template letters for quick responses. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:05:34] Thank you Jaime. Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:38] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just a thought occurred to me on the PacFEM briefing concept. Perhaps Council staff might consider making that an all-AB briefing opportunity virtual so that we'd be able to all attend at once. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:06:03] I Think that's a good idea that we can make happen. So, all right I see no hands up. I turn it over to Miss Katrina to see if we....have we done our task here to completion?

Katrina Bernaus [00:06:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you to the MPC for their work. That's completed a discussion on this item and your business is complete.

Butch Smith [00:06:31] Okay, thank you.

3. Special Project 2: Socioeconomic Framework

Butch Smith [00:00:00] So now we are to the point of Council discussion and I will open the floor to Council discussion. Seeing none, Council....No, I'm just kidding. Just kidding.....(laughter).... Corey, go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:00:22] Fastest discussion ever. In that spirit, I can provide a couple remarks and then just to say that I do have some written guidance if we want to use that to structure discussion, not to cut anybody off, just sharing. So generally I just wanted to thank Northern Economics and Council staff for the work. I think overall, ideally, there's a lot on this plate. Whatever comes out of it, ideally, hopefully this could be used for a lot of Council actions. I think I heard Mr. Atkinson mention, and then the GAP was talking about having trouble envisioning how this would actually be used, and I think that's fair because it's still pretty nebulous. You know we're still wrapping our brains around what all of this can do or what it should be. I think kind of the natural place, when I think about Council actions I think a lot about catch limits, and so questions in there specifically regarding kind of conversations we had around our last agenda item, how would something like this be useful? But I think that actually showed the value of thinking about communities and other external data sources in terms of how we think about what we do as a Council. I also think the Council makes a lot of other decisions where this tool could potentially be helpful. I mean it is meant to be a decision support tool, that is our goal. Something that can help us think through our decisions on any given agenda item. The EWG noted things like comment letters. I was thinking about things like when we do stock assessment prioritization how we prioritize workload? I was thinking of our Committee-of-the-Whole meeting, actually, if a tool or framework had been available to either help the Executive Director and Council staff or the Council think through things like prioritization, prioritizing things like CPS work. In my head this could also be a tool that the advisory bodies and management teams could potentially use, something that can help them provide more complete and better advice to the Council. Something like this is important for transparency to the public about how we're making our decisions. Trust, or if not trust, at least understanding, which is important for good governance as well as better public participation. I think it also big picture helps NMFS, which is the agency we advise to understand the Council advisory body and the public's values around what we do. I think I'll just stop there and offer guidance. Don't want to cut off any discussion, but those are just some opening thoughts to get us going.

Butch Smith [00:03:11] Okay, and I didn't point out that our tasks are there on the T.V. screens right in front of us, before us. So Brad I see that you want to go.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:24] Yeah I do. You know I think about what brings stability to communities, right? I think that's what we're after really is stability. I think it's one thing that I had a discussion in our morning meeting, I think Poggi mentioned it, we need some stability, and I think what we're doing, as a Council we're trying to do that. I think some of the changes we made for the salmon fishery this year I think is going to add some stability long term I think to how we do business in that state. I think the spex flex is going to help because when we can't have, when we lack stability, we at least give some flexibility to deal with it in instability if we don't have that. And so I think this Council is trying to do what we can, but we're statutorily obligated to follow

our SSC and the stock assessments come through, they say it's good, we're stuck with it and there's nothing we can do about that as far as implementing that. But there's things we can do as far as adding flexibility through spex flex or whatever else we.....there's things that we can do to minimize that and to mitigate to a certain extent. I think that I would hope they would look at this report, they would look at that, see what we already are doing. But it seems like successful ports have multiple fisheries to work with and over time there's a degradation of those fisheries, and as you start falling off the viable checklist you get in trouble. And all I know is with infrastructure we've had a lot of processors go by the wayside, and they're just holding on, they're still there, but when they finally fall off the cliff it's almost impossible to get them back. I am heartened somewhat by the USDA program acknowledging fishermen as farmers. USDA has a tremendous amount of assets. They're very concerned about rebuilding rural America. I think it's going to take a while to get that program up and going and understand how it works I think for everybody, but I think that that should be maybe a part of that report, of moving forward as far as people should consider that also. That's something we haven't had before and we do have it, we will have it now. It seems to be like right now resilience is, and the people who are processing fish, are centralizing themselves and have the boats run the product to them. That's why a few ports are doing well is because the boats that are home ported in other ports that don't have processing are fishing out of town for six, eight, seven, nine, ten months out of the year. And so I think that's what they're doing to get through the hardships that we're seeing. So....but anyway I think we're trying. I think that we're doing what we can. I'm hopeful to get some, you know, the stock assessment review we're doing and I hope we get some good feedback and maybe be in a better place. But ultimately we need to build the flexibility into what we do to help us better weather these short, more short-term issues like a stock assessment. So anyway, thank you.

Butch Smith [00:06:54] John.

John Ugoretz [00:06:57] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I think in terms of guidance coming out of this, because I feel like that's where the place we are in this effort, I want to look at what are we trying to do? What's the purpose? And if I look at the purpose in the report from the contractors that it's increased the Council's ability to evaluate the impacts of our processes, right? that I think is useful, something that helps us evaluate how our actions will impact communities and then to identify ways to bolster community resilience and develop a support framework. So I don't know that this process, the one we're talking about today, is what bolsters resilience. I think what bolsters resilience is our ability to understand how proposed actions will affect a community. And so if we have some kind of simple tool that we can help use to inform our decision-making, I think that's great. I want to be really careful that we don't anticipate or try to build something that is directive. I don't want something that ties our hands at some later date where the tool says something and we have to go another way. So this should be informative. It should help inform our decisions. Butch, you made a great comment about, you know, what do you do when we have to close a fishery? When we have to close a fishery our hands are somewhat tied. There's not an if, you know. If we do X, what happens? It's we are going to close the fishery knowing what might happen is useful. Knowing if there's a way that we can implement a closure that is somewhat different, that is better, great, but, you know, our hands might be tied. So anyway, I think just the short answer for me is it looks like they're going down a good path. I've heard lots of good input from a whole host of advisory bodies that the contractors can take into their next steps. I definitely want to hear back about where this is going because I'm a little cautious about the end product at this point.

Butch Smith [00:09:29] Just John, you know, and I think we do have a good example. Some of us, I wasn't at the table, but some of us were in this process when yelloweye, we could have taken a trajectory of recovery that would have closed practically everything in the ocean, but because we used the economic wait out and decided to go for a little longer recovery period, what we thought at that time, you know we kept the communities going somehow, some way, and I think that was a very good classic how the Council reacted at that time. I'm sure there's others, but that's the glowing one that comes to my mind. Corey, did you? Who? Gway. I'm sorry.

Gway Rogers-Kirchner [00:10:19] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I wanted to add that, you know when we were working through the Communities and Climate Initiative, and even before then when we were having workshops and getting information to figure out what that looked like, being able to take into account and recognize impacts to communities was a really loud theme that we heard from fisherman, from pretty much everybody that was in that process, and it's something that this Council has struggled to figure out how to do. What does that actually mean? And so I really appreciate this work. I think the team putting it together has done a great job to think about that and think about what information would be really valuable and useful in determining that and informing management decisions. I agree with John that there should be some, that this is a tool to inform us as we make management decisions, not to make management decisions for us. So yeah, I really appreciate that. I look forward to the guidance that we're going to give them. I think that's really going to push us in a good direction.

Butch Smith [00:11:46] Thank you. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:11:51] Yeah, thanks. Just quickly, trying to add a few thoughts. I think I'm wondering if we're over-emphasizing the word 'tool' at times. I heard that from a lot of larger bodies. It made me think, is NEPA a tool? And then it's a hammer that we drop on our toes sometimes or use to nail ourselves into small boxes. But it's.....I don't know, yeah so John's like it shouldn't be a directive part kind of caught my eye, so I'm kind of seeing this more of a....as one part of the qualitative way that we try to understand, like John was saying, the consequences of our actions, understand the communities, and we don't really currently have a way of using National Standard 8 in the decision-making. And so that's rather than a tool that you press the button and it tells you what to do, I'm kind of wondering if it could be more of a, just ways to help us think like, you know, NEPA was supposed to be a forcing, you know analysis forcing law, and this would maybe not forcing us, but helping us think and helping us like, help figure out how to build resilience better. So yeah, and on that last quick thought would be, you know the GMT asked who would own this tool? Again, is it like a tool or, you know, part of the thinking about this, if it's going to live on, you know we're probably not going to have the resources to hire experts to help us with it. It's just going to have to be woven into the way the Council and its analysts and its stakeholders think, and so that's how would make it a living thing. So yeah, starting...as I start off I just....tool might be this robot thing that tells us what to do but I just I think it would be more of a living way of helping us with National Standard 8 and other type analyses. So thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:13:52] Thank you Corey. Jaime.

Jaime Diamond [00:13:58] Thank you Vice-Chair. So one of my bullets was, yes, the comment from the GMT that Mr. Niles just brought up of who will be in charge of kind of handling it, what code or maintenance, whatever, just practical. I appreciate the practical types of things so just flagging that. And then I think back, we were talking about yelloweye rebuilding. I think about cowcod and I would love to see us going through this, doing a retrospective on something like that, seeing what it says as if it was happening right now, what that output would be and comparing it against, say, the public testimony of fishermen and what they said would happen if this goes through or when it goes through, what those outcomes would look like? What it would mean for them financially? And I think that's a pretty good test too. And because we've seen, we know what happened, we saw what happened, we've lived it. And a lot of those comments are precisely what happened for a lot folks. And so I think maybe it might give a little bit more weight to some of the comments from fishermen when they give that type of feedback, but it kind of ground-truths what they said I hope, because that's what happened, right? So yeah, it's something I've been thinking about a lot is we have the people doing the thing, they're saying this is what's going to happen and that's what happened and at some point we have to stop saying fishermen are liars, you know? It gets old. So I'm excited for this to help kind of get that through there. And then as far as resilience. Resilience is, and I've said this before, my least favorite compliment is being told I'm resilient, or fishermen are resilient. It's exhausting, and what that means is maybe you're still technically fishing, you know, a couple months a year, but you're doing catering, you're doing construction, you're doing side jobs. You know your wife's watching other kids and doing catering or doing odd jobs here and there. It could mean a bunch of different things and the fact that you're still technically fishing, is that resilient? And so I struggle with that. The second best option I think is what Miss Lent said and people went into a certain fishery because that's that's the job they chose and if they have to then buy other equipment or other gear to go into a different fishery that's not what they chose. That wasn't their intent for their career. Maybe they're still technically in fisheries, but I know a lot of charter boat operators, whether it's captains or crew or even boat owners that have entered into also commercial fishing because it's not enough. And so it's on the commercial side, it's also on the recreational side very much so. So this is....it'll be interesting to see what this does, how this helps guide decisions, but I also think about....well I think this could be a useful tool. I think there's also things in other agenda items that, as we've acknowledged today, some of these things will all come together in maybe the TORs discussion as well, but just put that out there. And I guess I would just put out, I believe we should be looking at a retrospective, some action items here, a retrospective look and something along the lines of a yelloweye or cowcod rebuilding type example that does encompass both recreational and commercial. But I also really appreciate the thoughts of the GMT and others that brought up something where there is just an abundance of information like the trawl rationalization or gear switching, although I know eyes roll when you mention those things. So I believe we were maybe looking at two, if it's two, then maybe it's one that's commercial and one that's maybe more recreational, but if we can do something that crosses both I think that would be really helpful. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:18:47] One thing that helps resiliency is have robust fisheries so you have the money to weather the storms, and I think that sometimes either we forget it. At one time we were up here and now we're down here, and down here looks normal. You know we always should be trying to.....I think the gentleman from, I think it was Seth that said that very same thing, let's try to improve the situations of the port, not just keep mediocrity going, let's try to build on what we have and expand and get new people into the fisheries that can afford it, or can make a living at it.

So anyway, tribal, non-tribal, it's all equal around the same. We're all in this thing together. And Jaime you're right, if you're a fisherman you're either crazy or resilient or a little bit of both because you don't survive in our line of work without those two characteristics. And so any other comments? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:19:56] Just one I forgot to mention. And it's just, I wonder in the end, and Butch I'm thinking of listening to you over the years and others but...and Jaime I like the rebuilding ideas, those would be really interesting. But the.....just I wonder what this, in the end this analysis is going to tell us, like what is actually in the Council's control. And I'm going to not even maybe finish my thought there because I want to not, but yeah, sorry, thanks for the opportunity, I forgot to say that one and we have to remind it like watershed development, et cetera, et cetera, there's a lot, that's economies, so that's a lot that's maybe going to show up is there's nothing we can do about.

Butch Smith [00:20:40] Anyone else? Did you have something further?

Corey Ridings [00:21:04] Yes, it seems like now's a good time to....

Butch Smith [00:21:06] I sensed you wanted to put your hand up, so Corey Ridings go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:21:11] Okay, tower of power, if you could put up the guidance that would be great. Okay, thanks. It's a little bit long so I'm just going to take it a piece at a time. Also just wanted to open, this is meant to be guidance, very specifically not a motion, so that there is room to move and encapsulate the conversation that we have here as a Council and give Northern Economics latitude to use their best judgment and also stay within Council budget and timeline. I also wanted to echo what I just heard from a couple people. I think John started it talking about the importance that this should not be prescriptive, that this is a tool to use. A lot of the concepts that we're discussing are too complex to be captured in a tool that would be prescriptive or tell us exactly what we're doing, so I think it's very appropriate to think of this as an informative tool. I think also, while this is guidance, and I've tried to capture a lot of what our ABs and MT said, there was a lot in those reports and it was really good, so I would encourage Northern Economics to use those documents as they move forward. And also, echoing other Corey's thoughts about kind of the tool, it's been called tool. I think we told them to develop us a tool and they use that language in the report, but I also agree with Mr. Niles that that might be too.....let's think a little bit more expansively on that. So with that I'm going to jump in here. So Number 1 I have is, endorse the proposed method based on the vulnerability framework adapted from Golden, et al, 2024 as described in Agenda Item D.3 Attachment D.2, draft community resilience decision tool methodology. And this is just kind of putting down that as a Council we do endorse the framework that they brought forward for us. I think it's best practice and based on the best available science that we have. The Golden framework is described by the Northern Economics Report is what I think to be a very good analytical framework and something, an excellent way that we can build out our tool. Number 2 is, include other measures of the adaptive capacity flexibility domain beyond diversification. So for example, loss of identity associated with leaving fishing. Include metrics and data for the other 5 domains, which are assets, organization, learning, agency, and sociocognitive as well. And where quantitative data is not available to include qualitative narrative or description, excuse me, descriptive information. So thinking about this, reading the report, the

GAP analysis as well as public comment that we heard from Dr. Rogers, if you only use and make decisions based on what you can measure you won't meet your goal, and you're not really doing any service and your results will be biased. So even if there is sort of nothing because the concept is too complex, or we don't have the data, or we don't have the science to really fully understand it, it should still exist in our framework and tool at least as a placeholder. I think the GMT had a really nice quote in their report, and I can't remember who it was or, sorry, I don't have it in front of me, but it kind of said just by simply recognizing something you're taking the first step and addressing it. Also, when thinking about that specific recommendation around flexibility, there's more to flexibility than diversification. So using that example, there is value to a fisherman in being in a certain fishery and potentially being forced to move to a different fishery has value to that individual potentially, so it's not a kind of net zero move. That could be something that loses value to that person or to that community in question. Regarding Number 3, include in the decision framework where feasible, excuse me, where feasible and in the associated indicators and data concepts of the social aspects across exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity categories, equity and environmental justice, profit, and cost of participation, Council structure and process, target stock, health, and structure, and infrastructure, and social capital. I found social aspects to be missing. I asked a question to Northern Economics earlier, but I think it's important to include those in how we think about this. And also including things that are essentially the cultural aspects of fishing, which cannot be captured necessarily by economics if things are not economically rational that we're trying to provide for our communities. Equity and environmental justice is an important lens to understand the impacts of our management decisions. We've heard a lot at the table, especially in the past year or two, about the importance of going beyond revenue to better understand profit. And as noted by the EWG, the cost of participation are important to understanding as part of that, sort of the financial situations of communities that we're looking at. Council structure and processes themselves I think are important that impact communities, things like remote participation. Target stock health and structure. I think this likely goes into the exposure category, but defer to bigger minds than mine. Butch actually just noted that robust fisheries are the best way forward. I want to be part of that thinking optimistically about the future, envisioning growth, envision plenty. I think this is what the GAP was getting at too. Also, we heard a lot about infrastructure and social capital. This came from the SSC as well as previous discussion we've had here. I think that's something that's going to be very important for the Council to think about as it can moving forward. Something I'm noticing as a little bit of a theme and from our discussion today, questions across these, thinking about that changing infrastructure and sort of the importance of understanding history. This comes up with the importance of why thinking about EEJ, histories of violence against indigenous people, how our ports have changed over the last hundred years. There's actually a French term I can't pronounce, it's something like Monge d'Oreille. Rebecca just laughed.....(laughter)....Again, there's bigger minds in this room than mine, but the term essentially says that historical context is really important when you're thinking about the future. To the extent that this work can engage history and think about how that informs what we want for our future, I encourage that. Okay, on Number 4, explore a more expansive definition of fishing community that is not only geographic, and as part, consider the definition provided in the groundfish FMP. I think geographic made sense. We heard, I thought this was very well described earlier, I think it was by Melissa and Karma, about why they're doing that. And I think it's important to continue that slightly expansive view that they described earlier. Number 5, include description and exploration on how the tool operates between individual and community scales. I think it's difficult enough right now to understand what this tool might look like and for

people to say, how is this going to help the Council? How is this going to help me as a fisherman? How is going to us as an advisory body? And I keep going back between sort of individual and community scales when I'm thinking about how we're going to think about this and what the tool might do. So just asking the folks at Northern Economics to continue thinking about that. Where are things different at the individual scale versus the community scale and how we as a Council should sort of walk that line? Number 6, in addition to the final tool, consider and provide the following outputs where feasible. So a mechanism for ongoing improvement and suggested Council review timeline of the decision tool, logistical recommendations for how to insert this into the Council process, a summary of data needs, their sources, timing, and associated costs, areas for future research and development, and conducting a baseline assessment or creating a plan to do such if it doesn't fall within the budget and time of the project. So I think any tool needs to be revisable and updatable as new data and information occurs. Of course, it's really important that this is something that we can use so it should fit into the Council process. Some sort of summary document that outlines sort of metadata gaps and how to get that, along with estimated costs, would be a really nice sort of appendix to the tool. Hopefully we can add some of that to our research and data needs in conducting a baseline assessment. Number 7, considering as part of tool development, how will the tool nexus with NEPA and other common Council analytical documents? If the tool should have different versions for each FMP, consider existing data and knowledge tools and portals that they may provide data and input. PacFEM was brought forward yesterday and I think that's a good example of the types of tools, portals, and information that is available. Narrative and qualitative metrics and data and how this tool will incorporate and treat Indigenous knowledge. So this tool should really dovetail with existing requirements and Council documentation. We don't want to recreate any wheels or be duplicative in our efforts. This is not meant to replace NEPA or other Council documentation, just to be efficient where possible, kind of the how, when of the Council receives information and how the Council and NMFS staff do this. We've heard some debate about a single tool or one that can be different across FMPs. I think that's still up in the air. I think it could go either way. To me, there's difference between fisheries. There's difference between FMP's and the way we conceptualize things like vulnerability or resilience might be different, so providing Northern Economics with the flexibility to either come up with one or several as they see fit. In my mind they would be similar, but just providing that latitude. I want to make sure that we're utilizing tools. I've said this, we already had capitalized on what NMFS or Pacific States has already done. And thinking about the narrative and qualitative metrics and data, as I spoke to a little bit, I don't think there's any need to disregard a component of the framework just because we don't have the data or it's difficult to measure. Narrative and qualitative information is important and necessary and the Council already treads and trades in these types of information through its public comment, the AB advice, Council member personal histories. And literature shows in many cases, actually qualitative data or narrative data is actually better than quantitative data or a sort of data that seeks to ignore the context or sort of oversimplify something that requires more context and understanding. And finally, I think the tool has to consider how indigenous knowledge is going to fit in. How it's going to be respected? How indigenous thought and sovereignty will be included or not included, if that's the case. Okay, I'm almost done, hold on. Eight, decision tool ideas. And this I put in here because as I was discussing with folks listening to conversation, just throwing out some sort of straw fish to shoot at and give some ideas for Northern Economics about what a tool might look like. So something like a qualitative impacts matrix, a decision support document that's maybe a flow chart for Council entities to work through as part of their work on any Council agenda item, and a list that can act

as a guide for Council as they consider Council actions. The idea would be to provide support for reports to the Council and fodder for group discussion or just personal reflection and analytics. The tool should really be simple, repeatable, and easily accessible to analysts, Council participants, and the public. I think that's a direct lift from the EWG, just noting that this won't work if you can't understand it. So everybody should be able to have access to the tool and use it as they're thinking through whatever fishery action they're considering. Nine, consider the following retrospective Council actions for use as a case study. I think retrospective is the way to go. There's going to be more information, sort of a complete case so to speak, and doesn't put Northern Economics in the spot of sort of making recommendations for something that the Council's actively working on. So three I have here, salmon, the 2024 season setting, that could also be....we heard some comments earlier about the response to the warm blob that we saw in coho, so we may pull out there that particular year and that particular management cycle and apply it there. Groundfish, we heard a lot of support for development of a rebuilding plan. Again, leave that to folks. We had advisory bodies weigh-in on several options. We heard Council members talk about that. And trawl rationalization, I personally think that's a pretty big lift to ask these folks to do but I'm putting it on the menu here. And finally, timing. An update from the project team in March or April of 2027 that may have to be in the informational reports, similar something this coming November would be very helpful so the Council has a sense of where this project is going, what's left to be done, and if there's any input or needs. I have faith that our Council staff will flag that for us. So apologies, that was so long-winded. I was hoping to capture a lot. There's a lot here on the table. Again, this is probably impossible to do all of these things. This is for discussion and for Northern Economics to take a peek and have some guidance and provide next steps, leaving them the latitude to do what they see fit.

Butch Smith [00:36:47] So, thank you Corey. It's pretty aggressive, you know, and we'll have to pick and choose but....on some of these, but I appreciate the time you put into this. It's real extensive. First John, and then Jaime.

John Ugoretz [00:00:00] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks Corey for a lot of work on this. It is a lot, it is guidance, and I don't think we're going to vote on this. I appreciate some of the things you said that aren't written on the screen, and I just kind of want to highlight some key points that I want to be sure is in the record. In 6b, you know these logistical recommendations for how to insert into the Council process, this is where, and you said this, but my point that we need to make sure that this is not prescriptive. It could be part of the process, but it's informative. In 7a, similarly how there's a nexus between this and something like NEPA or other required documents. Again, that's not what this is. It might help inform that, but I want to make sure that that's clear. Whether or not there should be different versions, and for Mr. Niles, I'm not going call it a tool here. I'm also not going to it a knife in our chopping block or a bow in our quiver, but whatever this is I don't know that there should be different versions for every FMP. I'd rather have something simple and easy to follow. Not all aspects of it might apply to all decisions we make but that's okay. In eight, the decision support document with a flowchart. So I start to worry again when I see words like flowchart because flowcharts usually end with a decision, and your choices along the way take you to a final end. And so I don't think this is a flowchart. It might be a cookbook. But, you know again I just want to highlight that this should not be prescriptive. And then finally in the case studies, I think Butch came up with a case study, I don't know if he said yelloweye but it was groundfish so I ignored it, but I think there were some other good suggestions there. I think the

SSC wanted to limit this to maybe two at most case studies, but I just, you know, I guess let the contractors look at the range that's been provided and choose one or more case studies that help demonstrate how what they develop would have worked in the past so we can understand it better. Thanks.

Butch Smith [00:02:53] Thank you John. Jaime.

Jaime Diamond [00:02:55] Thank you. It's partially based on Miss Ridings what she's offered as possible case studies, but going back to what Mr. Niles said right before when he kind of flagged the idea of a rebuilding plan, like that's kind of it, like it's a prohibition and that's it. So rebuilding as opposed to specifications after a rebuilding action? Is that? I'm trying to, based off to Mr. Niles I guess really is, it started turning in my head a rebuilding plan kind of, and I think Mr. Ugoretz also kind of flagged this a little bit, a rebuilding plan when it's, when that's it that's it, but the specifications after that might be more appropriate, I'm not sure. I'm just asking this as putting it out there for discussion, rebuilding versus specifications.

Butch Smith [00:04:01] Gway you're next, but since there was a question asked I'm going to give it....go ahead Corey.

Corey Niles [00:04:06] Yeah, no, thanks Jaime. I took in Corey's different views, but I was thinking, like Butch gave the example of with yelloweye of, there was a choice, choices considered about how quickly to rebuild, so there's still some flexibility in there within the legal constraints. But yeah, so I was thinking of Butch's, like that choice of alternative rebuilding timelines kind of thing.

Jaime Diamond [00:04:34] That's kind of what I initially had been thinking in rebuilding, but then I'm wondering and I'm putting it out there just again for conversation versus like specifications after, like there's the rebuilding and like what that'll do, but then we then typically have to make changes to other stocks or co-occurring species and changes to those other things with the specifications as well. So I don't know if there's feelings one way or the other.

Butch Smith [00:05:05] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:05:05] You know, I think we're thinking the same thing, but a lot of us in this room had to go through the needs of the fishing communities analysis, so that's what I hear you saying is when you're weighing different rebuilding options you're looking at what the management measures would be and what those consequences on fishing communities would be, so I think it's....yeah, it's the actual stuff that goes. And with yelloweye and canary it was like it's obviously not just those species, it's all the other ones that it limits access to, if that's what you're getting at.

Jaime Diamond [00:05:40] Yeah, that's kind of what I was getting at, okay.

Butch Smith [00:05:42] All right, Gway.

Gway Rogers-Kirchner [00:05:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks Miss Ridings for putting this all together. I think this is really thorough and moves us forward in a, in a great way. I do have one question in thinking about the case studies and the retrospective case studies, and I thought I understood it and then I think I overthought it and then didn't understand it quite so well anymore. And so my question is, looking at trawl rationalization, if that was our case study, would the case study go back based on the data that we had when the trawl rationalized decisions were made and look at what does the not tool tell us would have happened and compare that to what actually happened? Or would it do something else? Because it seems like if we were to look at today, today we can't really say, what if we did trawl rationalization today based on the data that we've gotten today because we already did trawl rationalization and that changed things, so it's not comparable, right? Pre and post-trawl rationalization data is not comparable, so how would the case study inform us looking at that in particular?

Corey Ridings [00:07:19] That's a good question. I think some of this case study, I think Miss Diamond just spoke to the....a little bit of a struggle here to pick out exactly what we want from our case study. In my mind, to answer your question, this is just me speaking here, I'm certainly not a case study expert, which would be, you would use the information that was available at the time. So that would be thinking about things like I would expect whoever analyzed it would go back and sort of look at the documentation, look at public comment, like look at the information that was available then and think about potential, you know, what, which one of the....how many of these concepts that we're talking about were discussed? You know, what would have....we can't say what would've happened because we don't know, but like how many of these concepts were part of that? You know did those concepts end up, even if they weren't explicitly called out by our non-tool that was not available then. So those are the types of ways that sort of I would think about if I did a retrospective case study, but I have to confess I think this is really something for the experts and maybe we can call them back up to the table to talk about this or....(laughter)....

Butch Smith [00:08:31] Well we're kind of time crunched here, so....

Corey Ridings [00:08:36] Okay, well, I'll just leave it at that and say....

Butch Smith [00:08:38] They're hearing us though....

Corey Ridings [00:08:39] You know, this is advice to experts who are doing this work for us and I would leave it to them.

Butch Smith [00:08:47] John.

John Ugoretz [00:08:50] Thanks. And based on that discussion and what I've heard so far and Miss Diamond's question and Mr. Niles' response, I actually feel even more strongly that the yelloweye rebuilding decision would be a good one to test where a decision was made, there were choices made about how quickly to rebuild at that time, and understanding how information like this would have influenced that decision, would be very clarifying in terms of how this might work in the future. So I'm just going to put my hat in there for I think that's a good one to test. I don't think the example that Gway provided is a good one to test because I think there's way too much

in there and there's not a clear nexus between the decision and how it impacted the community, where that yelloweye one did.

Butch Smith [00:09:43] Mr. Chairman.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:49] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I appreciate all that. First, on the case study, I'm not sure what is the best. I think that a theme I got from all of these reports was something where community impacts were a meaningful variable. And certainly rebuilding plans and the impacts of closing fisheries and that are important, but I think it was emphasized or stated in there, there are legal constraints. So I'm not sure if that case study gets at what we really want, the community impacts, or in some way is just pointing that the MSA and its rebuilding requirements should be changed because look at what it caused in these areas. Somehow that's just sticking in my head, but I heard what John just said on that, you know there's good aspects, but what is it we want from that? The trawl rationalization is a very big one, but I mean there were a lot of community impacts there that are variables. I don't know if there's something in between. I haven't thought enough about that. So I'm not picking anything or narrowing it down at this time, that's just some concerns in my mind. The other piece, and I appreciate Corey for all the thought and the long list here, you finished up saying maybe it's impossible, and I think the length of the list my fear is maybe it is. And the question might go to Gilly thinking about the timeline, this is a special project, how long we can get through this? How we look at these things, and maybe some are easy buttons that we can incorporate in there that are real important and.....because it's a big workload for the staff and I'm not sure how Northern Economics looks at this in the timeline. And that's really my concern is, is this too much? You know and we have to make sure we find the really critical elements. So Gilly, there was sort of a question there, is what do you see here and how would we proceed?

Gilly Lyons [00:12:23] Thank you very much Mr. Chair for that question. I think I would say, and I would also invite Executive Director Burden to share any thoughts he may have on this, but I would say that I think the ways Council staff might approach this is very much in keeping with what Miss Ridings said, which is this is sort of a....it's a pretty comprehensive list of ideas and recommendations and some suggestions for sort of next steps and to inform the development of.....the further development of the methodology and the framework and how it gets applied. And I think it would probably just require maybe a probably a more detailed conversation with the project team about what feels feasible of course within the scope of the project both time-wise and resource-wise. And so I think with, and I felt like that was very clear in what Miss Ridings put forward in terms of just what could we do reasonably from this universe of great ideas, so knowing that maybe it might not be possible to do all of it, although I'm sure everybody would love to try. So yeah, I think it would just mean having that sort of kind of check-in with the project team to see what makes sense or what could reasonably transpire. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:13:51] Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:13:53] Yeah, Well there's a lot here, I'll say that much. But I know a year ago we stripped out certain terminology from the Council and I look at 3b and I'm now curious why that's in there? And I won't support this personally if that's in there. If you want a dog whistle, that's it.

Butch Smith [00:14:45] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:14:50] I don't have a response to Brad, but I was quickly going to respond to Pete. This is a big, we don't time to debate this, but community impacts is at the center of rebuilding and I think it's very....but the thing is, I think part of what we should do is, yes, highlight where if the law is too restrictive, that feedback is important to the policy process. So when people say we shouldn't do it because it might show the law could be improved I'm always like, no, that's what we're supposed to be doing, you know, giving feedback. And yeah, I'll bug you when we have more time, but rebuilding, community impacts is named in the statute, like the needs of the fishing community. So I just want to respond to that briefly. Thanks for the time, and yeah, sorry Brad, I didn't have a response to your thoughts.

Butch Smith [00:15:40] So you know kind of the way I see this, this is an unfortunate thing about me having the gavel so I get to say this I guess, is we have the contractors here. They've heard the discussion. Maybe they've learned some new things, maybe they haven't. We have this litany of things on a list like we do a lot of our lists around the Council table. We've had some really good discussions I feel that didn't get in the list, but there's a lot of times we don't have a list and we have discussions that a staff officer translates. I don't know how the magic works Gilly, so excuse me, but you guys do a phenomenal job. And maybe that's too simplified, but I think it's.....I mean these kinds of things could evolve into infinity, they really could, and I think we've done a great job as a Council thanking Corey for her list. I don't think you intended it to be perfect at all, but it's a list, and I think the discussion, I think it can be, when you go back Gilly and work your magic, listen to the recording, or however you guys do that, I think there's some very good discussion. And I don't want to end the discussion, but you know we should move forward. We've got some other topics. And for awhile I saw them had their calculators out just adding some more stuff into the contract, so we don't want to make it too....but we want to make sure....we're all here to do this right, and if we're going to go through this exercise we want to do it of course right and to the best of our ability, so I think we've done that. I'm comfortable with what we have. I'm comfortable with, you know, that's not the holy grail list, and I think Corey has stated that. It's a list, and like I said, Merrick hires these great staff and team to work on this and throw out the bad and keep the good, and so I think we can, unless Merrick you have something to add, I think we can end this and I can pass the gavel back to our Chairman. Did I screw it totally up or?

Merrick Burden [00:18:12] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman. I think those are wise words. I guess I would just say we can take this list, and based on how Miss Ridings characterized this list, we can take it back and talk about it with the contractors, see what's doable within the scope of the contract and the budget of the contract, and the timeline of the contract, and we'll be well-intentioned about it trying to incorporate what I believe Miss Ridings is trying to get us to incorporate. So hopefully that's good enough.

Butch Smith [00:18:43] Okay, and Gilly I don't want to skip you, did we do our job here or did we flunk?

Gilly Lyons [00:18:51] A plus, plus! Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, you've had a really great discussion this afternoon about the materials in the briefing book, the synthesis report, the gap analysis, and the draft methodology. And you've also provided guidance, both written and verbal

here, to help inform next steps with the development of the decision support framework. And you have identified, I think, a suite of potential case studies for the project team to work with as they continue to build out the methodology and the framework over the next several months. So with that, I think that your work here is complete. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:19:26] Thank you Gilly.

4. Council and NMFS Workload—Capacity Alignment

Butch Smith [00:00:00] So we are in discussion. John, you see how you did that?

John Ugoretz [00:00:06] I'll be honest, I am in a very different place I was before this all started, and I'm honestly a little more confused now about what we're doing. I see a purpose in the paper and I really, at least as of my last reading of it, I was appreciative of getting some concrete examples about what leadership is looking at in terms of how we might address a capacity issue at NMFS. At this point I'm just....I don't know where we go next. The paper is, it's a good starting point, it's food for thought. It's certainly incomplete. There's definitely other things that the Council is doing that we could stop doing that would provide capacity savings for NMFS, and the report notes that there's other things that aren't on here. What's confusing me now is that the report includes a variety of things that we are already doing and we're moving forward with and those things require capacity to complete, and I don't think the report is saying we should stop doing those things. It's suggesting that completing them might have capacity savings. I guess, in my mind, a good next step would be to look for things that the Council is currently doing, look at the whole, the universe of things we are doing, the things we work on, and if we stopped doing one of those things what would the capacity savings be and would that put us in a better place and put NMFS in a place? And that requires some prioritization among things that we are doing that we can stop doing. So they have to be things that we are doing that are not statutorily required. And so, you know, I'm a little at a loss. I think if I was to direct Council staff to do anything that would be my next step, is to take this list, refine it, and add in recommendations on things that the Council does that we don't have to. And I'll give two examples. One, based on this discussion, you know, how has NMFS capacity reduction impacted the work we do? Well, it was brought up this morning. We used to get a report that a NMFS staff person prepared on the estimates of total bycatch in the DGN fishery. That was based on some modeling work and some work that NMFS staff created. That person retired. We don't get that report anymore, and instead we have a state representative to the management team prepare a simple report on observed bycatch in the fishery. Do we need that report? I'd argue no. At this point, it's a report on a fishery that is sunseting in just over a year. We could just simply wipe that one off the slate. It reduces the need for NMFS to refill that roll that they could use elsewhere. It reduces the workload on our state staff who are being asked to now do it. So that's one example. Another example, there are a variety of things that we do that could be eliminated that maybe we don't want to, and so that's where I'm seeing some additional work on prioritization. But we have a really good report that is the annual state of the California Current ecosystem. I think we all appreciate that report and value it. That report, I believe, causes workload at NMFS. That report is not required. It's not something that we have to do. Is it something we should continue doing? I'd say yes, and we need to consider what that costs and what other reports might not be able to be completed because of it. So those are sort of my two examples. And I don't think I can look at anything on the list in the report in front of us and say immediately today thumbs up, thumbs down, let's do it. I think you know it is....the document is there. I think it should be a living document. I think should inform the work we do moving forward, but I don't know that there's anything else that we could act on today from the report.

Butch Smith [00:05:50] Thanks John. Do you want to respond? Any other discussions? Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:06:03] Thanks. And thanks John for kicking us off here. I want to start by saying I appreciate the table and the work that was put in front of us. I know that took a lot of effort. Again, it's transparent and appreciate that process. One thing I almost asked as a question, but it may be more of an observation, but I will stand to be corrected if I'm misunderstanding, is the table to me. John observed something similar around groundfish. These are all items that are underway and I think it would be....I can't imagine the Council sort of deciding not to do those. So to me that was sort of, those are sort of perhaps a misunderstanding but kind of done. And then salmon is not on the list and there's a good explanation of why and I appreciate that. So that really just leaves CPS, HMS and ecosystem. There's one very small HMS item and a whole bunch of potentially very major CPS items that would have impacts. And then I think it's categorized as medium ecosystem. And I think for me that's not totally complete, and maybe it feels complete to the people who put it together. As a reader and a Council member it doesn't feel complete, and then maybe that's what John was getting out a little bit is a larger, more holistic look a strategic look across our FMPs and all the actions that the Council takes. But I did want to put that observation out if there's a way that we wanted to look at this either with a, with a finer grain that John proposed, or maybe just a second stab, having Council staff go back and think a little bit more about this or break this down differently or use some different criteria about how we make these decisions. I think that would be beneficial.

Butch Smith [00:08:02] Lynn Mattes. Oh, go ahead Merrick.

Lynn Mattes [00:08:06] Mine doesn't feed off of what Miss Riding said, so if you were going to.....I, since this item dropped, I've been struggling with what do we do with this information? How do we move forward? And thank you Mr. Ugoretz for starting with some thoughts. And I know we would be here for probably two or three days on this item alone, but we don't have any feedback from our advisory bodies. And I know we represent, we're here to represent all of our advisory bodies, but you know what may be important to the whiting fleet as a priority could be very different than what would be important to a salmon charter boat out of Ilwaco, just because I've got Brad on one side of me and looking at Butch. And what's important to groundfish would be very difference than what's important to CPS. I know we were trying to be very streamlined at this meeting and just have us. So I do struggle a little bit that we haven't heard from our advisory bodies on how to move forward, and maybe that wasn't the intent to hear from them. Things like spex and stock assessment prioritization, I know how to make those motions, I know how to provide that guidance. This is one I'm really struggling with what do we do? What is needed of us other than say pick 1.A.2 or 1.B.12, the numbers, I need a little bit more than that. Or maybe that's not what's expected of us today.

Butch Smith [00:09:43] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:09:43] Yeah, I appreciate this discussion and these comments. I'll go back to the latter part of the Situation Summary and maybe try to recast that a little bit. We're not looking for decisions today. What we've done is we've discussed a lot of ideas, some of which we said there's no way we should propose that, but that are not statutorily required, maybe getting to John's point. So the list of things that we could come up with is immense, and so as we have talked through and filtered through what seems reasonable we've developed this paper, which is not an exhaustive list, it's not a complete investigation of the ideas, but it provides a sense of our view of

some reasonable concepts that could reduce demands on the system in different ways. And so that paper then is provided to you to say, do any of these ideas gain any traction with you? And we'd like to know if so. And we'll take that and then we'll develop a deeper dive on those concepts to bring it back for your consideration, for advisory body consideration. But we're looking for some prioritization from you all about which of these ideas make sense to you, or do they raise other ideas in your mind that you'd like to explore further? But we aren't making decisions here. That will come over the next several months as we outline next steps. Hoping that helps a bit. I guess one other, one other comment just to Miss Mattes's suggestion about hearing from our advisory bodies, absolutely. We highly value our advisory parties, but as a matter of process design there are some times and places where the Council just has to set priorities for the advisory bodies rather than the bottom up process that we value and love, but there are times where we say, it's the Council's turn to take leadership and provide instruction to advisory bodies. So that's why we aren't hearing from them today, but as we move forward we most certainly plan to do that.

Butch Smith [00:12:15] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:17] Thank you Vice-Chair Smith. I suspect you're trying to get us to a point where we can go to lunch. I really appreciate that explanation Executive Director Burden, that was really helpful. One place I haven't been able to check in with our salmon folks, but I kind of am hearing John North in the back of my brain at the moment. I think the salmon folks would probably agree on the guidance of maybe let's not do anything with salmon right now. It's a special, it's a special thing that needs to stay in its own process. I think that's one of the recommendations in the table. I believe ODFW would be supportive of not doing anything with salmon at this time, if that's helpful.

Butch Smith [00:13:03] I would agree with you Lynn. John.

John Ugoretz [00:13:10] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair and Lynn, I think I can agree with you on that as well. In looking at the Situation Summary and Items 2 and 3 and the Council tasks.....oh look they're on the screen now too. Guidance, the types of capacity alignment ideas that we should consider further I think I'll go with what I said, that we should look at things that we are doing that are not required and efforts we are engaging in that aren't required and whether or not we can stop. I think that's the only way to save capacity and it saves capacity for NMFS. It saves capacity for Council staff. You know, so it saves floor time for all of us. And then you know requesting additional information, I think the one task I would say is to, you know, have a look at, you know, this list and see if there are things on this list that fit that. And then also, are there additional, not necessarily low-hanging fruit, but things that might require this Council, I think as Merrick mentioned, to make a choice for this Council to stop doing? And I don't want to prioritize anything on this list beyond what Lynn said right now before doing that.

Butch Smith [00:15:04] Thanks John. Yeah, Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:15:09] Thanks John for those remarks. There are, as I think through what you just mentioned, there are aspects of it that seem straightforward. You asked or you raised the example of the work of the CCIEA, which is valued but isn't required in my view. Where it gets challenging is looking at within FMPs. So those FMP's have been approved by the Secretary and

there are, I think of our groundfish FMP, it is exhaustive. There's a lot of things in that FMP I would say are not required but that are desired by this Council. So do you have any thoughts about how to look within FMPs to answer that suggestion that you just made?

John Ugoretz [00:16:00] Thanks, and through the Vice-Chair, I think that's a good idea. I think on this list, for example, you call out CPS. In fact, it's listed as kind of one of the top things to consider for changing the way we're doing something somewhat dramatically. I think there are species in the CPS FMP that we could examine removing from that FMP entirely, and I think that could be a worthwhile discussion. When that discussion can occur is somewhat dependent on other CPS workload, and we've just sort of bitten off a big piece in terms of sardine that I think is also a valuable process that we should probably complete and then do that next step, so I think there's time within that FMP to do it. HMS, we are engaging in some pretty significant workload that is either in the FMP or out of the FMP, depending on how you look at it in terms of the roadmap work. I'd note that NMFS is getting credit for working on the EFP process. I think we've made some gains there. Maybe we want to look at that FMP and consider, you know, the most immediate need is complying with the federal law that sunsets DGN so we have an edit to that FMP that's needed. That might actually be able to be accomplished with some administrative changes that don't have to go through our normal FMP amendment process, but you know there's things like that. So yeah, I think we can look within the FMPs and then it becomes a matter of scheduling.

Butch Smith [00:18:06] Thanks John. Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:18:08] Thanks John. I think hearing your explanation there I believe we are actually closer of mind than I thought we were about five minutes ago. And so some way to look at the paper here is that we've gone through each FMP and we've said, from a reasonable perspective what do we think we could reconsider? And so thinking about groundfish, these things are already underway, we've kind of already said we want to explore them. What we aren't exploring in groundfish, for example, is like getting rid of entire sectors or bag limit structures, things that would be unreasonable to toss out of the FMP. What we are saying is, well, let's look at the way in which the IFQ program is designed and monitored, et cetera, do we need all of that? So you just made a couple of other examples on HMS, like is there an administrative way to process the DGN prohibition? That's a good idea. So that's the kind of thing that we were hoping to hear from you all. So I don't know if that gives you greater comfort, but I think the conversation we're having right now is exactly what we are looking for, and you've added two dimensions. You've added an idea within the HMS FMP, and you've said statutorily, bigger picture, not within FMPs, but across all of our work are there things that we are doing that we don't need to? That element is clear to me. It's the within the FMP that gets challenging and that's what we've tried to do here.

Butch Smith [00:19:48] So Merrick I've got a....oh, Corey Ridings. I'm sorry.

Corey Ridings [00:19:54] Just thinking on this, and thanks for some of that clarification about what we're doing here, it's helpful. I think one thing that I think we need to learn a little bit more while thinking about this as a Council and thinking about prioritization is that nexus between the things that are getting done federally right now and that we've lost and that are going to the states. And I'm hearing very clearly that the states do not necessarily have capacity to pick all of this up.

And I think that, if possible, they need to be included in this decision or some way to bring that information forward so we have a better sense of what that looks like. If the Council deprioritizes something or takes something off what we're doing and, or NMFS does that because they simply have to, what does that mean for the states and what impacts does that have? And I, as much as possible, would like to have that be a two-way discussion so that the Council can support, the Council and NMFS can support the states and vice-versa. And maybe that already happened and it's just not apparent to me from this document, but to me that feels like a necessary component if we are going to be as thoughtful as we can possibly be when cutting work. My second thought is a smaller one, but just around thinking about Council process. John brought up bycatch reporting and that triggered for me....we heard under groundfish we had a bycatch report which I had some questions on and sort of the answers became, well, we can do sort of a consolidated report. We can give it to you once a year and that can provide the information in like a summertime one shop kind of way. And that certainly isn't a finished story. I'm not sure what other kinds of reporting we're going to get. But what I took away from that was that was potentially some NMFS folks thinking about, okay, how can we not only create a better communication product that our Council and our public can understand better, but also potentially that might have been some workload savings. I don't know that. Just thinking about ways that the region and the Science Center can be more efficient in how they work with the things they bring to us. I'd like to sit here and say what those things might be, but that knowledge is really in house at NMFS. So maybe that's more of a reflection and an openness to saying to the extent that NMFS can do those things, I hope the Council can be receptive to them. And the idea would be that for both the Council and NMFS it would have some savings.

Butch Smith [00:22:45] Thank you Corey. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:22:52] Thanks. I have a process question and I'll just apologize in advance if you've explained it and I don't understand it, but how is this coming back? What is the next step in this conversation? Or I'll just start with that.

Butch Smith [00:23:14] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:23:14] Yeah, thank you. And I would say it's okay to not be clear here. As Jeremy indicated, we're the first Council that's doing this and so we're sort of creating the pathway as we go. My thinking is that, first, I'd really like to know how you are thinking about this issue? So the exchange that John and I just had, I think, was helpful for me. I don't know if you all agree with our exchange, but it was helpful to me to think about where John's head was, which was big picture. What is our core responsibility and what isn't, and let's explore that some more potentially if the rest of you are interested in that. There might be other ideas where you say, I want more information about pursuing, say, a CPS FMP amendment. So we would think about that in our workload plan and bring back some additional material for you when we are able to. So right now, like our CPS work is, we are really busy in the Council and the Science Centers and the Region. We wouldn't be able to pick up a CPS FMP amendment at the next meeting. We're probably looking at another year from now after we wrap up our current efforts. So we would bring back information on that if you're interested in it, when we're ready, right? So it would be under the auspice of a FMP amendment in that case. But I think if you were just to focus on structurally how are you thinking about this issue, like John outlined it in his thinking, there's core responsibilities,

there's everything else, we can take that and fold that into our workload either under a FMP amendment or maybe it's just a discussion paper of some kind, but it would be really Kelly and I working to nest that into our workload planning discussion. Is that answering your question, Heather?

Heather Hall [00:25:07] Yes, big picture and but more of like right here right now. Are we going to continue just brainstorming? Because I like what what John threw out there and that idea and I appreciate it, are we going to keep doing that today or are we're going to come back and do more of it or come back and offer other ideas that haven't come to the table this morning?

Merrick Burden [00:25:37] Yeah, I think I see what you're getting at. I would say I was about to try to start to wrap us up, and it was going to be a couple of questions. So I'm going to go back to John's suggestion. The way that he framed it is, what's core and what's not? And I want to understand that more deeply. So that's a further investigation that we would have to do with the Science Center and the Region, and I'm not sure exactly when we would bring that back to you, it just depends on workload. If you, as the Council want to keep a placeholder in subsequent meetings for having a discussion where we raise more ideas, we can schedule that, but that's not something I've thought of yet. I don't see us coming back at this meeting to talk about it more.

Butch Smith [00:26:33] John, the man of the hour.

John Ugoretz [00:26:34] Hope not. No, thank you Director Burden and Miss Hall. I think....it's taking me back to where I thought I was on this document this morning in that I see it as a useful set of potential opportunities. And you know the way I was looking at it was it would be a living document that whenever we in an FMP are discussing workload, we have that document to look at so that we can look across FMPs while we are having discussions within an FMP. I think there may be opportunities to Merrick's point that this comes back to us in some revised format, but at the same time I don't see a need to have a regular scheduled discussion of it. I'd rather see it occurring in those FMPs, which gets to Miss Mattes's point of when do we hear from our advisory bodies? So that's during the workload process, right? Groundfish has its workload and annual process to look at that, right? So that's where I see that happening. Obviously some of the things I've raised, some of things that have been discussed might see a revised version of this report at some point that comes back with some more information.

Butch Smith [00:28:14] Rebecca.

Rebecca Lent [00:28:16] Yeah, thanks. I like the way this is going. I would also say that every time we sit down and think about what are the next round of stock assessments we're going to do, that we look at the report that's been prepared and saying how can we prioritize stock assessments. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:28:33] So you know, and that's my kind....I kind of like to see some of this prioritization on a piece of paper because we....man we've spitballed about these kinds of things for like, I think Brad said for days. I remember we talked about cutting a work group and that took 6 hours at a meeting a few January's ago. So I think to move this forward we have to see, but I want to, and I know all you guys know this, but I want say this, you know cutting is hard, but we

also want to be cognizant of, we want to be able to maintain the fisheries that we manage, but we also want to leave ourselves room so we have growth where growth is needed. We don't want to tie ourselves down that the excuse is, well, we just don't have the money to see if we can....I'm not saying new fisheries, I'm saying the fisheries that we have. I'm just so afraid, and I've seen it, that we get so wrapped around the axle we forget that the people that we serve, the communities that we serve, sometime the reason they sat on the dock was to get the benefits for sitting on the dock and get back in the water and fish on a recovered stock. So I just want to, in our thinking of all this, I certainly want that to be that little salt tablet, you know on the recipe, because I am worried about that and cuts, because you know it costs money to go fishing. Anyway, I will get you Aja, but I got to get Brad first. How'd you like that one? Pretty tricky. Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, I think realistically, I mean we always should be looking do we have to do it, right? And because, you know, if we are always doing more than we probably should be doing then something comes up we really have to....we really want to do, or we need to do it, if there's no capacity we're just stuck. I mean I look at this table and I think it's great because it lays out, it's a mix, things we're already doing, some things we could be doing, kind of maybe gets the creative juices flowing about what direction we might want to go. But I mean salmon and groundfish are the biggest fisheries, right, that we do. I mean salmon's off the table. We're already in the middle of a trawl review, spex flex, I mean we're always doing a bunch of work on groundfish, so all that's happening ahead of this. HMS, we're working on some good stuff right there so it's not like....the only thing that really is hanging out there is really CPS. I mean most....there's already things happening, but I do think that we always should be looking at ways to minimize action on things you don't need to be doing, otherwise we have no capacity to do the things we might want to do or need to be done.

Butch Smith [00:01:17] Thank you Brad. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:01:23] Thank you. I've been trying to stay quiet on this one because I have a lot of opinions, and I also worked at NOAA for a while and understood how dire the situation was there beforehand, and I also hear the states are experiencing the same exact thing. I don't think that we can go forward with not discussing this again. I don't think we can just be like, oh, we got some ideas on paper and then we don't have to do anything else. I think we do need to plan to come back in some way about it. I agree that maybe seeing it in concert with some of the other bigger ideas or some of imaginations that we came up with today might be helpful, but I disagree that like, I think something more needs to happen. We're struggling with the same thing in the whiting process as well outside of here. We're getting a lot of calls in that arena and the Northwest Fisheries Science Center contributes a lot to that work as well. We're getting calls in that arena that the process that was built for the Hake Treaty is too cumbersome and that Canadian staff and U.S. staff can no longer uphold the number of meetings that are outlined and set up in the treaty, and then we're not doing anything to change it and it's incredibly frustrating. And so I know everyone wants to get to lunch. I would like to see some way for us to have conversations about this in the future. Perhaps it does come up in individual FMPs. I know that we do this in groundfish but....and yes, we did lightly do it in CPS as well as we were starting to embark in that direction, but I do think we need some way of continuing to make sure that we're meeting the state's and NOAA's capacity like really attentively. So I think, you know Brad, you said yes, we should obviously be looking at things that we should be cutting off the list if they're not necessary anymore. The fact is that we

haven't and that this is one of the first attempts to do it. So I'm just really hopeful that, yeah, I'd like to leave this with picking it up some way again in the future, and I look to guidance around the table about how to do that, but I don't think leaving this agenda item with like, that was a nice report, is the right response. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:03:34] Heather, then Corey.

Heather Hall [00:03:37] Thanks. And I'll just say this conversation has been really helpful because I struggled with how to go about it. And the exchange I just had with Mr. Ugoretz really helped me understand how parts of it can go forward in real specific ways under when we talk about groundfish or CPS or that way, and we have a really nicely designed groundfish workload priority process that we use and we can rely on that. But circling back to then the big picture I think is where you're asking to come back and where I've thought too, is how do we talk about what are the things that we don't need to do? And I keep thinking of a set of principles, like what tells us, what helps us do that? One of them, the first one's obviously in the report is, we are obligated to our treaty trust responsibility. That's off, that's off the table. That's something we will always do that's not even in question, but are there other principles that help us decide what, what don't we need to do? I note that's maybe a little rambling, but it's my way of trying to think about how the conversation continues maybe in a couple different ways.

Butch Smith [00:05:08] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:05:10] Yeah, thank you. I think this is a good discussion. And your most recent point there Miss Hall actually brings me back to our Committee-of-the-Whole discussion and seems like ages ago, but we did spend some time breaking down what our, quote unquote, core responsibilities are and what they aren't, and so those are outlined in the Magnuson Act. There are ESA requirements. There are treaty trust requirements. There are a couple of other things that we lump in as core. And I felt like with the help of Dr. Dahl back at the time we were able to pretty well define that, and I'm hearing from you and from John and from Brad that there's interest in understanding that more deeply in this context, so in the context of what don't we need to be doing that we are doing and is that a significant draw on our resources? So perhaps that's one bit of direction that you would like me to pursue with our NMFS counterparts. The other one.....ooh, I'm losing my train of thought, sorry. So maybe that's a question to you all, like, does that delineation make sense? In this document we can expound upon that sort of bigger picture, core versus non-core activities, and what is the draw on our various offices from doing those things. So if that's something you would like to see we can look into that. And then as we think about our sort of the FMP view, I do think it makes sense to have that be a discussion that's at the FMP level, and I think that's what you all are saying. And it feels disconnected to have that discussion here and then go talk about workload planning with that FMP in a different place, but this paper can still help us with that. And so perhaps it's a matter of saying, throughout our FMPs we should be thinking about capacity issues in all of them, and as efforts roll off the table and we finalize them we're thinking about what's next, this should be a conscious discussion all the time. And so we have some standing ideas now and as they get addressed we can add more ideas to it. And so maybe that's another question. Is that a way forward that you all would like to do? And if so, I think that goes to the, like living document idea that John has been referencing. Is any of that helpful?

Butch Smith [00:07:46] So before I take the next question, I'm kind of looking in people's eyes and they're kind of looking like we're running out of sugar in the blood to keep going on. And so do you think there's a need to push on or come take a lunch break and come back and finish up after lunch? I don't know how much more discussion that we want to have, but kind of a phone poll here. What do you think? Corey, I'll take your question and then we'll see. How's that sound?

Corey Ridings [00:08:12] Okay, thanks. So this little additional conversation was very helpful. I'll just start. Aja, thanks for your comments. I think that that is something we're hearing and it's just like the hardest thing the Council has to do, which is deciding what work not to do, and we very successfully avoid that where at all possible. And the reasons for that is good because we want to do the most work that we can to support fishing, and so I understand that. I also hear from you and hear from this document and the folks here, there's not space left, so that has to happen and I hear that and I agree with that. Merrick, you just said a couple of things that were on my mind in response to Heather and that's very helpful. I think thinking about through this, Merrick you just the FMP level is perhaps a resolution as opposed to sort of looking at this overarching, we need to do both. And I really support that in terms of, you know like I said earlier, groundfish isn't really on here because we're already doing it. And salmon's not on here for very good reason, which I think we've agreed why. But I think that it does make sense if we're going to do this very hard work, is to take a look across all of those FMPs and see what we can do. And I think a part of it is not just what we're doing but how we do them is something we also need to consider in this, which is that the way that we do some of our things, even required things, could change and that could change if we can keep them or lose them, so I think that's an important thing to think besides just picking our children is to think, you know, can we....I'm not even going to try an analogy right now on my low blood sugar, just to say that I think that If we think about that as well, and especially in concert with NMFS and the states, I think there could be some ways that we don't have to pick as many children as we might otherwise have to. So just wanted to put that out there. And also, I think Merrick your suggestion about this list I endorse that. I think we should keep the list, have it be living. Everything in it seems appropriate for me to forward, including ongoing thinking. I really struggle with the concept of having, like, planning to plan to plan to be efficient, but these are really, really hard things and they do deserve time. So keeping this document going thoughtfully, potentially adding to it, John's lens really feels appropriate to me still thinking about the required, non-required, core, non-core, to discuss. I'm just going to stop there. That's what I'm hearing and appreciating that and just wanted to reflect back a little bit and endorse kind of what Director Burden said and what some others have said around the table.

Butch Smith [00:11:10] So thank you Corey. So Merrick, I'm just going to ask you the question here. You know through plenty of great discussion and our NOAA Panel this morning, do you think you have enough to go on right now on what you've heard and come back at a.....I'm hearing kind of a list kind of thing so people can see and get your thoughts wrapped around what would be. I mean I'd like, before I start throwing people under the bus or out the window, I'd like to know what that means in dollars and cents and value and all that good stuff that goes into this kind of stuff.

Merrick Burden [00:11:51] I think that was a question for me Mr. Vice-Chairman. So I think we've gotten somewhere, and I keep looking at, you called the NMFS Panel, and I'm curious just if you have any reactions about where we seem to be landing, which is the FMP view that we took

is helpful. We'll keep things there and keep exploring them and then as we are able to think about FMP amendments we'll be consciously thinking about some of these ideas and how they might save some of our capacity constraints. But then also adding a bigger picture view and saying what are the things that we're doing that are not core activities and how much would that help? And so that doesn't get us to any decision here. We weren't looking for a decision here, but that is a way forward and I'm just curious if you all have reactions to that.

Jennifer Quan [00:12:47] Well I really appreciate the conversation. So I would say mission accomplished in terms of sparking the conversation and hearing people's thoughts about it. Having actively living in a prioritization process I feel like you're thinking in the right direction. You know I would love the idea of, what are we doing that we don't need to do, right? That's a really good question. It's a good one we should just do regularly. So I like the scales that you are proposing and I do think it can be iterative. I like an FMP lens. Like every time you're touching your FMP having that question come up, and maybe there's one or two things you can be like, oh, if we just tweak that, a little bit of savings. And then kind of the bigger wholesale look. So I think, I think you guys are on the right track in your thinking.

Kristin Koch [00:13:51] Thanks for the question Merrick. I echo Jen that I think this is going on a good track. I was curious about some of the things that were not captured in the report that may be in play in terms of ancillary things or things that the Council's doing that maybe not be something that fits into that core category, so wherever those items might fit in I'd be curious to see those. I think as we....I too think have experimented in the past within my own Science Center about core, non-core type activities, particularly when we get into these budget constrained environments, and so that's not new to me. I think it'll be interesting to see where the Council comes up with core activities versus how the Science Centers and the Region might look at those various topics in their respective domains. I think, for example, I think the Science Centers in particular are somewhat charged with looking around the corners of things, and so the ESR was brought up as one example of something that may not be core, and I don't want to necessarily put my thumb on the scale in that conversation. I do think within the Science Center's the Council is a core part of what we do, certainly. It's not the only thing that we do, and I think in that vein of sort of looking around the corners, I'm always looking at that balance with our ecosystem science in particular, but other things too, of what are we doing that perhaps is just core adjacent that allows us to keep looking ahead and looking around those corners, and the ecosystem arena is one of those arenas. So I feel relatively strongly on that. We see, particularly in the science that we provide in the southwest and the stocks that we are concerned with there, you know we have these boom and bust cycles. I think ecosystem science for the southwest has always been a core part of what we do and it will remain that way I think to some degree, it's just a question of where is that line? So anyway just some extemporaneous thoughts as we...as I listen to the conversation here. Thanks.

Jeremy Rusin [00:16:23] Thanks. I don't have too much to add. The discussion has been super helpful for me. I like when our group has gotten together and we've shared ideas. Those new perspectives always trigger new ways of thinking about things, and your discussion here today has helped me think about things a little bit differently than we had previously, and have some new ideas there. And I just appreciate everyone's taking this on board. This is, it's a really challenging discussion and there aren't easy answers and it's hard to just kind of spitball ideas real time, but I think this is definitely a step forward and everyone just really taking this on board as something

that is important to make progress on, you know is, I think it means a lot and it means we're going to make good progress on it. So thanks.

Butch Smith [00:17:12] Thank you.

Merrick Burden [00:17:17] Well then, just I guess back to your question Mr. Vice-Chairman about whether we had enough. I think this has been a good discussion. I feel comfortable with it. We do have some additional work to do and looking at things to do, and not sure exactly when we'll have time to do that but we'll look into it. So unless there's anything else, I feel like your task is done here Mr. Vice-Chairman, but happy to take any additional questions if there are any.

Butch Smith [00:17:47] So thank you and thank the Council for the great discussion and thoughtfulness. And like I said, once again, Jen, Jeremy, and Miss Koch thank you for coming. Is there....seeing no hands fly up, I'm only looking with one eye, Mr. Chairman I'm going to turn it over to you to take us to lunch maybe or maybe to another hour of topics, whatever you want to do.

E. Groundfish Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, public comment, takes us to our Council action, which is consider the updates, discuss updates, and comment as appropriate. And let me look around and see if there are any hands? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:17] Thank you Mr. Chair. I plan to follow-up with our trawl reps on this conversation so I'm not trying to respond in full here, but I'll just note on cost recovery. You know cost recovery is a challenging topic everywhere and we're ready and willing to continue to talk about it. I think for the Council's perspective I want to just highlight that we agree that this program's too expensive. I think that's where we've gotten, that this program is too expensive for the industry and the agency doesn't have the funding to support it and we're not bringing in the cost recovery money to support this program, so we should change the program. That's where were at and what we're looking at in the trawl follow-on actions where we are evaluating what is the most bang for our buck in terms of reducing the cost of that program. That's why we pulled together funding to do the cost evaluation so that when we go into that we can figure that question out. So I think there will always be more to discuss on cost recovery and I'm happy to have those conversations, but I want to note that we see and hear the need to make a big change and we will work with the Council on doing that to try to solve that issue for the industry.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:39] Thank you. Any other discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:48] Yeah, thank you Chair. One of the early things Miss Kent talked about was doing the port tour and being in Oregon. We've already communicated with her, but ODFW staff are on standby to help coordinate, help put Miss Kent and staff in touch with the right people, help schedule things, et cetera. And I think the staff look forward to the....the NMFS staff and the ODFW staff look forward to having this port tour happen. And reaching out to the industry directly is much appreciated.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:25] Thank you. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:02:28] So just gleaning from the....what is it? The rulemaking workload gear marking and entanglement that's going through, I noticed that I believe it was the state of Washington published an infographic with the different colors of ropes for to like put it out for recreational for all people to understand like what ropes colors you should and shouldn't be using. These are for these specific fisheries, you're free to use anything else. I came across my feed and I really.....I think that's a great tool and I think it would be of interest as once this comes out if we can have some type of graphic that can go out for folks, for the public. I know this is like such a little thing, but because I just saw that it's fresh on my mind and who knows when this will actually go through, but I think that's something we should be ready with and to put it out to the public that they know like what colors are for what and already claimed as for use in some fishery. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:38] Thank you. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:03:40] Thank you Miss Diamond. I agree, and we have those kinds of outreach materials in production right now. One of the main things that we produce with every rule is called a Small Entity Compliance Guide. We do that because of a requirement under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, but we use that as the primary way that we're putting out plain language information of how to comply with rules. So we have pictures of rope. In fact, we've reached out to various rope distributors to have them send us samples, and we're taking pictures of those different light conditions. We were talking to our marine mammal folks about pictures of that underwater as well, because there's a lot of things. There's the piece of the fisherman buying the rope, but then there's also the implementation of. With enforcement, what does that rope look like? How do we make sure it's the right color? We're trying to take a simple approach but there's a lot there. So same thing with the cattle ear tags that are part of that rulemaking, pictures of that for fishermen and information on what does mean, right? How to make that, how to comply with the rules. So that's all in production right now. I a hundred percent agree that having those types of materials available for fishermen to be able to comply, but it's also a broader audience and making sure that we're putting that information out for people.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:54] Jaime.

Jaime Diamond [00:04:55] Thank you. I really appreciate that because there's other commercial fisheries, but maybe state fisheries like California lobster, and they're using whatever rope they have in their backyard kind of thing. And so they, and a lot of them don't participate in maybe necessarily other fisheries that, federal fisheries, that they would know that this is even happening. And so because I know folks plan far out, they're buying material ahead of time, the sooner we can get that out so they aren't accidentally having to then re-buy new ropes and re-rig all their gear would be great.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:30] Thank you. Not seeing any hands right now, I mentioned I had some comments regarding the Marine Mammal, Seabird, and Turtle Report. I want to emphasize first I have maybe some harsh critiques, but then some I hope constructive comments, because it's a draft report as I understand, an opportunity to change, and then why it's important. In my perfect world, the title of the report would be, "Interactions with an Incidental Take of Marine Mammals", things, but it's been shortened to bycatch and it's a NMFS Report Science Center, so that's fine. I agree with the GAP comment about the reference to the global, sort of the global perspective on bycatch and how bad that has been in some circumstances, but I encourage, as you look at that, to think more locally. As they said, there's some success stories here, some things to look at. And, you know, at the big picture it paints the bycatch as bad, and I'm not arguing those global statistics are incorrect, but you know it paints it up as here's the impacts of fisheries and here's what....and what this report does is just give us the absolute numbers on what bycatch has been and allows people to make their judgments based on that. I encourage the Science Center also to take a hard look at other language in the introduction. You know, I hate to be so critical, but there's a statement that says all sea turtles found in U.S. waters are listed as threatened and endangered. That, I believe, is true. And then it says, and the ESA requires that bycatch of these species be minimized. ESA does not require that. You know, bore you with statistics, I looked through the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, The Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the U.S.- Mexico Agreement to the Treaty Act, and couldn't open the U.S.- Canada one, in all of those documents the word 'bycatch' is used twice, and it is only in reference to a report that the Secretary of Commerce gives

to Commerce about efforts to monitor and do that. So my.....the constructive piece of this is I encourage you to, well, so I thought, well, where does this bycatch of birds and these other things, because the MSA bycatches only fish, so where does it come from? And digging around I found on the NOAA National Bycatch Strategy website, there's an excellent description of how they've characterized that as bycatch and how all the regulations work together with the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in ESA. A very good description of that, and there I can see how they came up with a construct, but that that doesn't come out in the report. So I encourage you to look at that and incorporate some of that language because it provides good background on why we think of that as bycatch. And why I think it's important, you know, that we do it, and maybe a little other context for the report, is bycatch is in the news and it's not that we try and ignore it and brush it under the rug, it's bycatch closes fisheries, has the potential to close fisheries, and the fishers out there on the water don't want that, they're avoiding. And I think, as we said, the real story here is that across all these years, maybe there's been one, but fisheries haven't been closed because there have been violations of terms of the consultations under any of these acts, the endangered species, the migratory bird. They've been very successful, and even, you know, as I looked at the one graph, the California sea lion, maybe it's just that the height of the black bars and the number of California sea lions, but can't remember what the top number was there, 100 or something, but I went back and looked at what happened to California sea lion populations from 1980 to I think 2024 they increased threefold. Three times as many and if you look at the graph there's almost a slight decrease in interactions. My question about effort on there is, the whole context here is that we don't ignore bycatch but we still continue to look in the sort of the spirit of the MSA that max or minimize bycatch to the extent practical and are we doing that and are there other opportunities to reduce that? And so that's where the effort piece came up that I was asking about because there is a link in this report to some other reports that NMFS has generated on effort, and there's one that shows trawl fishery effort, actually since I think 1980. Since 1980 there's like a million, my visual interpolation of some graphs, over a million hours of trawl effort that's occurring. So I think there's, you know, something to be proud of there, and it just concerns me that some of the language there portrays this maybe in a negative light that really isn't there, that these fisheries have been managed successfully. So apologize for all the time, but there's a little concern about the message that could come out of that report and I just offer those observations. So with that, look around and see if there's any other? Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:12:10] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. And I tend to support the comments that you have made. I would even take it a step further that one of the missing pieces that I noted earlier was the types of surveys. It refers to ASHOP and WCGOP, and I didn't have time to dig into that, but understanding what the observer, the types of observer data are. So are they from direct reports where Heather testified earlier, Heather Mann, that they called it in? Plus they had an observer on board. Is that where some of these are coming from, particularly in the hook and line fishery? And that could be as simple as a table of the types of surveys that have occurred and the locations of those surveys to understand that coverage. Personal experience, when it comes to marine mammals in particular and MMPA, is it's the MMPA is written in a way that it bakes uncertainty upon uncertainty and that stuff can come back to bite us as Mr. Hassemer noted, and so they tend to, you know, these data will become BSIA once the report's published and it will get used in our buy-ops and everything else that we have, and so we want to make sure that the documentation piece is in there so that we understand what those estimates are telling us. The other thing I would note since we're providing some constructive criticism is, some work needs to be done on the Executive

Summary. It's kind of all over the map. The sets of years, I don't know if that's a typo where you go from 2002 to 2024 and then it goes from 2020 to 2024 when it comes to pinnipeds, so worth taking a look at that. It just sort of throws out a bunch of disparate pieces of information. And I'll leave it there.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:36] Thank you. Other comments? Not seeing any, I just want to close. Again say, you know really appreciate the report, the effort to put it together. The concerns are, it's just the message it portrays is what we intend there and want to get out and watch, be careful about that. So seeing nothing else Todd, anything else here?

Todd Phillips [00:15:03] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. No, I would say that you have heard from the Region. You've heard from a Science Center as well as the GAP. You've had good discussion. I would say that you have addressed your Council tasks and the action under this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:16] All right, with that, we need to take a break here so let's come back in 10 minutes if we can.

2. Inseason Management – Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So that takes us to our Council action. Consider catch projections and adopt any inseason adjustments as necessary. So Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:12] Thank you Chair. We didn't prov....ODFW didn't provide a report under this, but the GAP sort of spoke to it, just figured I'd address it quickly. In our commercial nearshore fishery and in our recreational fishery we did see higher than average catch rates in the beginning of the season, and then the weather changed in May. Most of May was snotty to say the least. Memorial Day weekend was a complete washout for the majority of Oregon. The bar, most of the bars were closed for the majority of the weekend so there was very little recreational effort. So May has come back down. We are watching things carefully. We have also, I'm glad the GAP spoke to it, but we've heard anecdotally from some of our charter fleet that there's at least one company that's not doing halibut trips this year because it's just not economical for them. And we've also heard from some of our commercial nearshore fishermen that the trip limits for rockfish, especially the black rockfish trip limit being so low in state rules, it's not worth it for them to go fishing. So some of those things that the GAP spoke to were seen on the ground too. Just wanted to add a little more context. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:28] Thank you Lynn. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:32] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to voice my thanks to the GAP with regard to the proposed reduction to the vermilion/sunset trip limits south of Point Conception. This isn't an easy thing to do. We are early in the year and yet industry reps got together and took a look at the progress of the fishery to date and considered that the Amendment 36 rule will be coming online soon and could have the effect of further increasing both effort and catch. And so, you know, we're still only 5 months complete in the year, but this is a pretty significant decision to make at this time of year in order to ensure that we keep within that projection that is for the commercial fishery, that hundred tons. So I just want to thank them for their early action to spread the remaining harvest out through the remainder of the year. You know they're anticipating conditions here, recognizing that the uptick in price likewise may drive increases in effort and catch, and I just, I want to just appreciate their work here and their recommendation, knowing that losing reduction in these highly valued target stocks will have an economic consequence to some participants. As Christian noted, we have seen a number of both Open Access and even Limited Entry participants achieving these trip limits already to date. So these are real reductions in income for those individuals. So again, I just want to voice my thanks to the GAP for being so responsible. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:52] Thank you. Any other discussion here or any action to take? Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:04:01] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair, I do have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:05] We're ready.

Marci Yaremko [00:04:06] Alrighty. I move the Council adopt the following inseason adjustments as described in Agenda Item E.2.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, June 2026. Sablefish increases. Limited Entry north of 36°: GMT Option 2, 7,000 pounds per week, not to exceed 14,000 pounds per 2 months. OA north of 36°: GMT Option 2, 5,000 pounds per week, not to exceed 10,000 pounds per 2 months. Limited Entry south of 36°: GMT Option 2, 4,000 pounds per week. OA south of 36°: GMT Option 2, 3,200 pounds per week, not to exceed 9,600 pounds per 2 months. Moving to the vermilion/sunset reductions for Limited Entry south of 34°27': GMT Option 2, 25,000.....sorry, excuse me, 2,500 pounds every 2 months. OA south of 34° 27': GMT Option 2, 750 pounds every 2 months.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:21] Thank you. I followed along. All that language looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Marci Yaremko [00:05:27] That's correct.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:27] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Heather Hall. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:33] Thank you. I think the report speak for themselves. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:36] All right, thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? Not seeing any I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:05:54] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:54] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Any other.....look around the table here first to the Council members, not seeing any hands. Todd is there more to do?

Todd Phillips [00:06:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. I would say that you have addressed your action here. You've adopted trip limits for sablefish and vermilion/sunset south of 34°27', and you are complete with this action.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:25] All right, thank you. That'll close out this agenda item.

3. Stock Assessment Process Review and Proposed Process Revisions

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes what we were trying to do with this agenda item today, a little longer than we thought. And I don't want to get into discussion on the topic, that will come in Part 2. But before we close it out I just want to take a little time, see if there are any overarching insights or impressions you might have, any thoughts that will help shape or guide our further work on this. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:33] Well, thanks Mr. Chair. I noted in my question to the SSC that it would be helpful while collecting my thoughts, our thoughts in particular, was to talk maybe have some dialogue with Council staff from amongst ourselves about as a couple of my questions got to, like okay that sounds like a good idea, how do we make it happen? And how does this relate to the Terms of Reference discussion we'll be having which will go in effect for next cycle. So maybe...yeah, that's what's kind of spinning around my head of some of these ideas sound great but what are the next steps for considering making them happen?

Pete Hassemer [00:01:18] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:01:20] Thanks Chair, and thanks Corey. I think what you're suggesting makes sense to me. I would like to pitch though, you know, one of my concerns in looking at where we may go here is I think there's the possibility that some of these pieces create a lot of new work for assessors or for STATs, and I'm very concerned about that potential, right? So I would just ask in those discussions, right, I think it's beyond just Council staff, right? We have Science Center leadership here. I think those are important discussions because I'm wary of getting forward on big new tasks that simply cannot happen with the resources that we have. So looking outside of those groups how can we tee things up? How can we use other resources to make some of these changes I think is really important for us to have something meaningful from this process. So I would just pitch that. You probably were already thinking of that, but want to make sure that that's a clear dialogue as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:17] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:02:17] Exactly. But yeah, because it's not....this is Diana and others put that list out there and did the workload assessment and was the vision that hey, I want this one, this one, that one, and that's like no, I don't see it working like that. But for example the SSC suggested we should give priority to those indicator and index-based methods for doing Dover sole kind of things, so where and how do we consider, and when could that happen? Yeah, those are exactly....how do get the feedback from the Science Center and others, and not just Council staff, on one, what ideas is the Council interested in, and then yeah, what's the consequences to workload? Where do we have those discussions is what I'm hoping we can talk about.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:16] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:03:18] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah, I appreciate that Corey, and I think I'm thinking the same way. I want to say, too, I think we took longer on this agenda item that we went through

all of the reports today, but I think it was necessary. I think we're in a good place with talking about some of the themes, but I feel like I have to recognize that the AI use on this report was really concerning and disappointing. I think there's a lot here for us to work through our process. We can make improvements to our process, I'm interested in those discussions, but I want to recognize that we started off in a challenging place. I'm hopeful to see where we can go with looking at productive changes to our process.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:59] Thank you. Executive Director Burden, then Caroline McKnight. Executive Director.

Merrick Burden [00:04:06] Yeah, thank you. Well as Diana indicated in her overview, there are several ideas that are fairly light lifts, and indeed we've already been just implementing them because they seem like no-brainers, they're good ideas. There are a few that are more moderate, and then several that are quite a bit more challenging. And so if you have things that you would like to pursue that are in that challenging list, what I would propose we do is identify them and then we can come back with a work plan where we can propose a way forward on those challenging matters and that would give us some time to talk with Science Centers and state agency, state data providers and things like that to the extent it's necessary to figure out really what it takes in more detail, and then we can have a more informed discussion about how to do those things. So I don't think we can resolve all of those workload capacity issues here in one fell swoop, but that's one way forward Mr. Niles to your question.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:09] Thank you. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:05:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. And I guess teeing off of that Mr. Burden, thank you. I heard pretty extensively through public comment here and through the GAP Report, and in the state delegation meeting we held, that holding an additional type of pre-assessment workshop would be highly beneficial, and that concept is listed under a red action item, which I'm still interpreting as not a no but a carefully considered workload, and I recognize that that involves both Council staff in terms of public noticing those meetings and scheduling them in addition to science staff to show up and STAT Teams to conduct them. And so it does not need to be answered right now in this moment, but I'm just looking for is that even tenable? Is that possible? And what would it look like? Because I think that holds a lot of merit in terms of responding to the public comment we've heard here, so it's just one thing I'm channeling. Another is, I guess a thought is I'm very much interested in the SSC's recommendation to improve the communication to the Council on BSAI determinations in their statements and what that looks like and when and where, and that is obviously tied to timing and species and other things, but that's one I think that we've not touched on much in this discussion, but I think is really the crosswalk between an assessment review and its process to how we make that jump to the next part, which is the management and the risk and the other things we're working on. And so I think having some more discussion about that would be very helpful. I'll stop there, thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:55] All right, thank you. Any other thoughts? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:58] Thank you Vice-Chair. Thank you Chair. Sorry, didn't mean to demote you. Taking in all the questions and discussion thus far, but I'm still struggling with what is

expected tomorrow. Is it guidance? Is it motions that the Council adopts X and Y? Just, I need a little more guidance on what the hope for the outcome from tomorrow is? And maybe I'm the only one. If I am I apologize. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:32] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:07:34] Yeah, I appreciate that question Miss Mattes. I'll contextualize my comment by first saying, I think what we're doing here is a process that will be ongoing for a little while and so we shouldn't view tomorrow as the stage at which we will solve all of our problems. And so where I think we are is in a place where we're still narrowing down and identifying a pathway forward, and that means there's a lot of complexity and a lot moving parts and puzzle pieces, that to me says guidance, because that allows me to work with my staff and others to say, okay, we've heard what you want and let us figure out how to do it, and then I'll take another step, as necessary, to come back to you and pin it down a little bit more and eventually we'll probably get to a motion, right? Motions that might resolve our COPs or revise our COPs or Terms of Reference which will come up later, things of that nature should become more concrete, but tomorrow isn't that step. Tomorrow what we want to hear about are what are the things that you want to keep pursuing? Give us some guidance to help keep flushing those out. And for some of these things we'll just go ahead and do them and we're already doing some of them. So that would be my advice tomorrow. What are the things that are really resonating with you? Where do you think you can make the biggest difference? What are some things you want more information about because they may be high workload but you're really interested in them, and we can come back with more information. Does that help?

Lynn Mattes [00:09:02] That was very helpful for me. Thank you sir.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:06] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:09:09] Thank you. And thank you for that explanation. That was helpful as well. And then I'm trying to think through, like we have two hours scheduled for the remainder of this, and then also the Terms of Reference later, and so I'm also trying to mentally like hold together. Maybe it's just that we can talk about things that are E.3 and then also note that they're going to come back later on in Terms of Reference as well. I don't know how to do that well.

Merrick Burden [00:09:39] Yeah, thank you. If I understand your question correctly, I think the Terms of Reference is a much more discreet box, right? And so it's something that we've had for some time and it's been modified for some time and now we're trying to improve it so it's a much more discrete task, and it does relate to this item but it's also much more discreet and so I think that's motionable, if that's a word, and you already have a fairly well fleshed out detailed outline about what the next step would look like. So it's important to think about that as you think about your guidance under this item, but you can also separate that and say we're much further along with the Terms of Reference. It's a much more concrete and discreet thing, so I think motions there would be appropriate. Did I interpret your question correctly?

Aja Szumylo [00:10:27] Thank you. I think so. But yes, as people drafting guidance and motions for this it means like looking out at those recommendations and then kind of pulling out the things

that are already covered in what's being proposed and the changes to the Terms of Reference already, and then sort of leaving E.3 to hold the larger, more holistic explorations that are coming from this discussion. So like I think there are going to be a bunch of things that, from my impression, I have not done enough reading yet on the Terms of Reference agenda item. But I do know from the SSC Groundfish Subcommittee discussions that I listened to, the materials that are there already, that there are some things that have already been in the works and in people's minds. So I guess what I'm trying to do for the public is make clear that like we are addressing some of these things already and thinking through them and not that we're ignoring them because that was the whole topic of this entire discussion was not ignoring feedback that we're getting in all these various places. So I'm sorry for that ramble, but just trying to keep everything held together and show that we're taken care of everything.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:44] Thank you. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:11:47] Yeah, and I'm still with Lynn. This is helpful, but here's maybe a dumb question that'll help me. But if we're doing it already then why do we need to adopt it? Like, what's the value that you're seeing in doing anything like that? Like, how would we....maybe I'll stop there and see, like, if we're already doing it, do you want to capture it in the Terms of Reference more clearly? Or do we just want to acknowledge that those recommendations were made? So, yeah, why would we do that is kind of one....would help me think through what else we do next.

Merrick Burden [00:12:29] And Mr. Niles, is your question in regards to the Terms of Reference and the efforts we've already taken there, or is it in regards the stock assessment review project?

Corey Niles [00:12:41] Thanks Mr. Chair. What I heard you just say is like tomorrow we could say, yeah, the green ones are all we're already doing, let's adopt those. But so what does the adopting them mean? Do they go into the Terms of Reference? But yeah, but then I'll maybe this helps a little bit better, but something like one of the red ones.....and thanks again, I thought that was really helpful Diana for doing that, but some people might not agree that it's red, it should be yellow, so we need some process to think through which one of those would do and which ones folks would want to do and then how you do them. Yeah, again, so maybe that didn't help, but yeah like, could we come in tomorrow and say, yeah, the green ones look good, what does that mean for next steps? And going back to your previous answer of needing a work plan with everybody, including the states and the Science Centers.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:38] Excuse me, I'm going to turn to Dr. Perry. Did you want to add something?

Diana Perry [00:13:42] Thank you Chair Hassemer. For Mr. Niles, our idea was to, we are going to be wrapping up E.3 before we get into E.7, the TOR discussion, and so we are hoping that the Council can identify items of interest for the TOR and they may come back up in E.7. And so I hope that speaks a little bit more to potentially that confusion. There's also, I want to note that we do plan to bring this particular item back to the Council floor in November. And so for those items that may be a little bit longer term, they may be yellow, they may be red, just to use that frame of reference for now, we do plan to bring this back to the Council floor for further consideration of those plans to try and implement those longer term items.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:35] Thank you. Any other overarching, not discussion, but things to help guide us? And to add to the confusion I think maybe Corey's question too, I was looking ahead to E.7 and what the tasks are and I think you can look at that and see how that tears off of what we're doing under E.3 and some of those discussions. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:15:05] Thanks. I was going to save this but then you said overarching so. I think as I've been reading these materials and thinking about this up to the meeting, something I've really been struggling with, which is something that Miss Kent spoke to a few minutes ago, which was sort of the use of AI, the methods that were used in this report by Lynker, and having this tension between appreciating the work that was done and also worrying about the validity of the results and how we should be using them in the Council process. And I came through sort of with a, I guess not really a split personality, but the realization it wasn't...it's not a science product. Thinking about the methods and the things that are in there, you know I am a social scientist and I know there are many methods that focus groups can be analyzed by how they're set up and they were not followed. Not to say that the methodology they used was bad, but it was certainly not sort of social science as we understand science generally in this process. So just to say I've been struggling with that. And as I move forward I think the SSC Report was really helpful for me because clearly they struggled with the same thing and how they thought about it. And I'm just sharing with the Council at this point. I think that Council staff have really done a really nice job putting this together in a table for easy digestion to think about moving forward. We heard from a lot of our advisory bodies. I feel like I'm hearing a lot of themes that we've been hearing for a long time that have come out today in the various advisory body reports and comments from other Council members. So just sharing that I'm carrying a lot of a little bit of anxiety and hesitation based on sort of the methods that were used as part of the report, but I also recognize it was a consultant report, not a science report. And so at least in my mind, I'm looking to the conversations that we're going to have to the advisory body reports that we received today, input from the National Marine Fisheries Service, and hoping that we can come up with some ideas tomorrow. So just wanted to share that.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:28] Thank you. Any other items here? Executive Director Burden, then Aja. Did you want to respond to that? Let's go to Aja first.

Aja Szumylo [00:17:43] Thanks. I just wanted to circle back on the AI comment too, though. I fear that we're overemphasizing a situation that I feel that Thomas adequately addressed in his response back to the Council about to clarify the use of AI in the report. And so I was a little dismayed by the SSC's....I felt that the second paragraph in their report was a little harsh. And I think may, I may be overinterpreting that they are holding on a little bit too much about what happened with that report, with the AI missteps with that report, and pulling that into what I think overall has been a really good discussion about the things that we're trying to think about and address for this process overall. So I don't want to sit in this space where we're like over like, yeah you were right Corey, this is not a scientific report, this is a reflection of where we saw mistrust in our process and a set of steps and guidance about where to go forward with correcting some of the things that we're having trouble with, with variable assessments. And so what I want to do is like as a community really sit back and say like we got....you know, despite what happened before, we got a lot of really good comments and feedback about where to go in the future with all of this,

and I think that's the part that we need to hold onto. I think I also, we're not talking about AI right now, but like we've got to like know that it is going to be used and not be so afraid of it because we're not going to get away from it in the future, and so that's for a separate discussion later. I'm wondering if that's something that we can talk about like as a community more in the future. But I would be....we're going to be in a lot of trouble if we don't acknowledge that AI is going to come into this process at some point in some way. So that's all. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:03] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:20:05] Yeah, thanks for that. I think this is a good discussion to have. Apologies Chair, I know you probably wanted to move this along. But just to clarify for that, when I'm talking about sort of the use of AI, what I'm referring to is something that was done on the first phase, you know sort of before the SSC found the hallucinated references, which is just simply the methodologies that were used to interpret the focus groups and the methods that were used to design the focus groups. There are many, many documented social science methodologies to do this sort of data collection and understanding and interpretation and I think those were not used. They were not intended to be used either before or after sort of the AI-ness of it all came out in April or March, whatever meeting that was. So my criticism isn't so much around that part of it, but as we think about methods I think it's just really good to be transparent about how we're using them. And I was listening to Larry Phillips saying, you know, confidence in what the science that we use is really important, and we're going to use it differently across the Council process. So for example, in this case it is a consultant's report. It is not a scientific report. These are the limitations. We want to be really transparent about what those limitations are so our public knows how we're using it and then do our best to use it as you said. I agree, I think this is a good discussion and I think it's important to bring these, you know the things that we're discussing forward and try to address them, even if it's coming from a non-scientific methodology, so to speak, I think it's what we went for, what we were trying to get out of the consultant's report. So, also to your last part, this is separate conversation, but this concept of a Council policy around AI is something our Director has mentioned before. I assume it's something that's being explored and just support that generally. You know, it's hard for all of us moving through the world with technology that's changing so rapidly, and then it's going to be hard for the Council too.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:14] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:22:14] Thank you. I appreciate that clarification. That was really helpful. I guess the other one thing I wanted to add is that, yeah, as Merrick mentioned, this was a little different. This was a different kind of report than a....you know the protocol that you might come up with for like random sampling in a community. So I think we're doing a little bit of attacking the report for....I think that they did, I think Lynker did exactly what we asked. And they were trying to....it couldn't be as random as people want it to be because of the nature of the situation. Yeah, certainly we could have talked to more fishermen in the community, but I also think that if we went further and expanded the sample pool of people that we talked to we'd probably get a lot of the same themes coming up. Like I think, I don't think that....like if we had gotten, if the folks we talked to said that the process was awesome and they loved it so much that I would be really concerned. That would be the part that I was like, oh, I don't think that this is quite matching what my experience of the process has been. But what I do, what I have read in the report, what I heard in

the feedback from our advisory bodies was that there were a lot of things that people agree that are things that we need to address. So I'm not.....you know, I guess the other thing I want to say is that the fact that we've needed to address these things is reflected in the number of actions that we have that all relate to this item. Like that we are already working on so much of this stuff that I don't want to over-question the results because I know that we need to work on this, like, it's there. We've got....I think a lot of you could offer opinions on what needed to change without even having gotten a reflection back from anyone. I think people could have, yeah, come up with a huge laundry list, and I think we can look through the comments that we've gotten through the Council body generally to see a lot of these things reflected. So yeah, I just....I'm scared of how much we're being like, oh I don't know. Like we know what we need to do. So that's all, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:37] All right, thank you. So a lot of information, a lot of material, a lot important things. Appreciate that discussion here. We do need to close up Part 1 so we can get toward other agenda items. So sometime tomorrow we'll come back to this agenda item and topic and finish it up. And I appreciate those first thoughts and discussions we had to have. So let's close this agenda item for today.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] We are going to come back to an agenda item we started yesterday, the Stock Assessment Process Review and Proposed Process Revisions. Yesterday we heard all of the reports, the public comment, and we had some initial discussion. Before we proceed today I'm going to turn to Dr. Perry to refresh what your tasks are and the path forward on this to help us before we get into discussion. So Diana.

Diana Perry [00:00:38] Thank you Chair Hassemer. As the Chair mentioned, you heard presentations from Council staff and Lynker yesterday. You also heard from NMFS and the advisory bodies, including public comment. We're back today to hopefully wrap up discussion and we are requesting the Council provide some written guidance. This is a reminder right now that we will return to this item in November and potentially in March of 27' for any longer term items, so please, this is not the last time we will have the opportunity to discuss this matter. The specific Council tasks before you are to provide written guidance establishing priorities for the 2027 stock assessment process, identifying any items to include in the discussion under the Terms of Reference under Agenda Item E.7, which is set for tomorrow, guidance on the development of a Council Operating Procedure for the stock assessment process, and provide any guidance on long term priorities. Thank you Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:46] Thank you. And I'm going to ask our technical staff there on this agenda item....yes there. It's probably a long list but there we are so you can see that and refer to that as we go through the discussion. So I've stalled long enough. Who wants to initiate discussion on this item? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:19] I'm nearly done with some guidance that I'd like to share with everyone and so I just want to put that flag out there, but if other people have things that they want to offer now in the meantime. I'll send it over to be put on the board in a moment.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:32] All right. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:02:35] Thanks Mr. Chair. I'll fill just a little bit of time. I just had some general remarks as we've gone through this agenda item, things that I've been thinking about, and I think, you know, just sort of laying out some of our thinking when we look at what the Council may choose to do here. One, just sort of re-grounding us and the need to balance new things that we're asking with the capacity to do that. I know this Council is thinking about that, but when I think about the assessor workload, the STAT workload, right? Those are incredibly complicated jobs and when they're in assessment season it's difficult to think about asking them to do another thing as good as the thing is. So when I think about trying to do something new, I just would encourage us to look sort of around at the additional resources outside of just those teams. I think there is good things that we can do, but want to respect the core work that we need those folks to be able to complete for this whole process to work out. I also think in general there's opportunity for us to improve and that I'm definitely interested in sort of taking this holistic look, but I also think as we've gone through our stock assessment processes over the years there is iterative improvements. I think about sort of the opportunity to implement some bigger changes if that's the will of the Council, but I also assume that this Council is really good at adapting as we go, right? That every cycle we're learning something and we're taking those opportunities to improve our process. I also want to address one of the things that has come up. I know it's difficult for me and I think some others around the table to separate some of what occurs in the stock assessment review process from how we apply that to management. And I know we're trying to focus in on what we're doing but definitely others around the tables have highlighted that what we do in this process is naturally connected to everything else and how we're going to use that science, and we're doing a lot of things on that front, how we are using it to try to look at additional flexibilities and opportunities, right? And we have Council agenda items on the Year-At-a-Glance trying to move ourselves forward on those pieces. And so I do see this as a piece of the bigger puzzle of what we're trying to do, and that is good for us to reflect on what we're doing here but it's really hard for me to break these two parts apart. The one sort of example I'll say on that is we've definitely heard through this process the importance of keeping the scientific rigor that we're looking at between the assessments and keeping that level of sort of the burden of proof the same over perceived overly pessimistic results and perceived overly optimistic results, and I absolutely agree with that, but I think that sometimes when we're in a resource-constrained situation and we don't have an opportunity to look under the hood of everything we would like, I want to recognize that we already have tools in the toolkit for one of those situations, right? When we have overly, what we perceive as overly optimistic results, this Council has the ability to do something less, right. We have the....we can do a variety of changes to our Harvest Control Rules and setting lower ACLs than what the assessment may say, that's separate from what the SSC looks at, right? So sometimes it's hard to capture that full picture where it feels like we're looking at only one piece of it, but I think that's sort of a good example of those situations where it's not just what's happening in the stock assessment review process, but it's also us thinking about what's coming out of that and how we're going to apply that to our management. What do we already have the ability to do and then what are all the great things that we're trying to build to give ourselves more opportunity? So that was just some of my overarching thoughts that I've been thinking through as we've looked at this process. I have really appreciated the opportunity to look under the hood here and look at our ways to improve our process. I'm really interested to hear from around the table and what everyone else is seeing as an opportunity to take a look at change for.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:32] Thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:37] Thank you Chair. And to give Aja a couple of more minutes. As we've been thinking about this process and going through this, I think of just how things have changed in the 18 years I've been in this process. My first STAR Panel was July of 2009 during what at the time was a record heat wave in Seattle. As the GMT Rep I felt I was barely allowed in the room. I think the phrase Jaime used yesterday was, to be seen and not heard. It was very much that feeling at the time. And then the GMT and GAP were slowly allowed to get closer and closer to the table. And now they're actually sitting around the actual table with the STAT Team and the CIE Reviewers and there's specified sections for the GMT and the GAP to weigh-in. We've started doing pre-assessment workshops to talk about the data. I know we at ODFW we have an assigned data person. All the assessors know this is who you go to to get the data, so we've been making iterative improvements as Miss Kent alluded to. There's always room for improvement and I'm glad we're looking at it. I just don't want to lose track of how far we've gone just in my career in this process from barely being allowed in the room to being at the table and helping with the discussion. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:01] Thank you Lynn. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:08:06] I'm ready if folks are ready for it, but I don't want to cut off discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:09] Let me just look. Any other general discussion? Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:08:16] Thank you. I won't belabor it, but what Miss Kent said about when we have stock....we have a stock assessments that go in a perceived negative direction and we're very limited on what we can do, but then when it goes in an unbelievably optimistic direction we do have tools that we can to address that, especially given workload constraints and all the different things we're doing. And last year with the roughey dark...dark black.....black spot, dark....anyways, you know what I'm talking about, we had that and we had widow and we wouldn't be able to do that type of review for both, especially coming off of all of the forks in the road and all of the things that were going on at that time, so using the tools that we do have to take those precautionary measures is really important to acknowledge. I also want to acknowledge it in the GAP statement. While this is definitely going to help make change, some meaningful change, they really also have concern of like the stock assessment itself and like whether it be modeling parameters, proxies that are used, things like that, and so they were hoping I think also, and I think that's maybe more in the TORs, but some of it is just set and nothing we can do, but they were looking at a very technical, an opportunity for a swipe at a more technical type of move and an opportunity for change or at least to kind of look under the hood on it. So I just wanted to flag that their comments I believe is like second sentence or third sentence of the second paragraph it was in there and so I appreciate that. And I just want to flag that like we have an incredibly brilliant group in the GAP right now that are very involved at a deeper level than they ever have and we should take advantage of that one and where we can. I think there was a lot of great discussion and a lot of things that we talked through that are good ideas and things that I think have been talked about for a long time to move into this. And I'm looking forward to what Aja has to say. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:40] All right, thank you. Then Aja I'm going to turn to you and we'll have more discussion after we see that, so please go ahead.

Aja Szumylo [00:10:47] Thanks, I can see the guidance motion. So this is just....this is written guidance, not a motion. And yeah, I'll read it first and then go into rationale for it. So I divided it into two sections, priorities for 2027, and then a section for a longer term work. So for priorities for 2027, proceed with all of the clarity and process navigation items in 1a in Agenda Item E.3, Attachment 2. So this is the big table that Dr. Perry so carefully put together for us. Thank you. And then I have a sub-bullet to that, include a discussion of how an assessment process works. And what I mean from there is going from pulling in data to start the assessment all the way to the BSIA determination so that we're working from the same framework about what the shape of the process is. Pre-assessment engagement. Expand pre-assessment workshop to include update assessments. Expand pre-assessment workshop focus to emphasize stakeholder information including review of fishery prosecution and stakeholder input on fishery dependent data used in assessments. Develop a plan for sharing assessment results with stakeholders once the assessment is finished but before the STAR Panel. Add an additional GAP or GMT, or GAP.....sorry, GAP or GAP recommended representative to the STAR Panel process, and so this would require an amendment to the TOR. Task the SSC with elaborating on improved communications with Council regarding BSIA determinations. And then the next page, if you scroll down, should be long-term priorities. So this is a big one. Refine the pause and off-ramp mechanism. So the request is to have staff work with appropriate NMFS staff to develop a discussion paper that explores how a pause or off- ramp could work and remain consistent with MSA. And some sub-thoughts there are develop a technical referral protocol that standardizes when the SSC should re-review materials, detail circumstances when an assessment process should entirely halt, and detail pathways for catch-limit setting when the SSC cannot reach a BSIA determination or when finalizing an assessment that needs additional evaluation. That will conclude after the specification cycle. And then the last bullet is explore a centralized data portal. And then I just nod to my favorite portal that I've been ranting about all meeting, the product from Nuts and Dot Earth. And then yeah.....what happens from here? Do I go right into rationale or what?

Pete Hassemer [00:13:31] Yes, this is guidance. You have the floor.

Aja Szumylo [00:13:34] Guidance. Okay, cool. All right, so beginning with thanks to everyone who helped work on this motion. The Lynker Report, which, you know had....was a process, but held a good mirror up to us about what we were experiencing in our stock assessment process. Again, to Dr. Perry for the work to pull the information from that report out into something that we could look at in steps. And then to all the advisory bodies who took that and digested what would be most important to them in moving forward. I left out some things that are already picked up in other places. So Keeley referred to this, but this is one part of a number of different things that we're working on. So one of the things is what we'll talk about tomorrow, the Terms of Reference under Agenda Item E.7. Already included there the Groundfish SSC Subcommittee met, I can't even remember when earlier this year, and had a really careful discussion about what happened through this year's assessment process, and already included a lot of the feedback that came up from industry and through just the experience of the process, especially with what played out with widow in the Terms of Reference, so there's a lot things that we'll pick up and discuss already there tomorrow. There's also some discussion in the GAP Report about a GAP-generated

fisherman report to incorporate local ecological knowledge into specific assessments. So that would be like a detailed description of the prosecution of the specific fishery that the SSC or that the STAR Panels are assessing, and the GAP Report for E.7 includes some discussion of how they envision accomplishing that and the timeline for that so I don't cover that here. There are some other things also in Special Project 1. So that was the special project that had, that was really long at the last meeting, so it was EFPs, local and traditional ecological knowledge, if-then statements, but the portion on local and traditional ecological knowledge discussed a larger GAP Report that would happen sort of at the end of the year to characterize the fishery for the entire year, so something similar to what happens in the existing whiting process right now, and I'm hoping that that will continue there. There was also a suggestion somewhere, maybe in the Lynker Report I believe, for some education around how to think about that kind of knowledge, and I hope that that can come up through that special project rather than being encompassed here. So then for things here. For the beginning, so clarity on process navigation, I think there were shaded green in the table that Dr. Perry put together. These are things that are already underway. Information about how to engage stakeholders, and again, information to stream things together for people so that they know what we're actually going through with the process. For pre-assessment engagement there are several things here that I'm trying to use meetings that we have already to add in some of the things that were discussions that came up through the advisory body. So again, here pulling in the chance for industry to talk about how they prosecute the fishery. The data that they use would come up in that pre-assessment meeting as well, so it would save creating another additional meeting, but just expand the purpose of a meeting that we already have set up that was traditionally just focused on the data that's used in the assessments. There's the bullet for sharing the assessment results with stakeholders once the assessment is finished, but prior to the STAR Panel. I did not, I specifically did not say a meeting on purpose. I'm leaving that up to the Council and to our staff at NOAA and the folks dealing with the assessment to come up with a way to do that sharing. One of the ideas that came up was using the existing cope calls, and Jason if you're listening out there, sorry to co-opt your call as a place to do that sharing, but just thinking of some way to give folks a chance to have some interaction with the results of the assessment before we get actually to the STAR Panel so that the stakeholders who are engaging with the assessment can figure out what kinds of questions to ask. And also with update assessments, they offer the chance to update fixed parameter values based on new science, and so understanding the impacts on the model results early would allow for more effective engagement during the actual process of the assessment review. For GAP representation, I'm asking for here another GAP representative. There are times....so this would be two GAP representatives at the meeting. There are times or at the set of meetings that encompass assessment review, there are times when I think the GAP itself may have the expertise in the fishery that we're assessing, so expertise in prosecuting that fishery. But if there's an instance where there's a fishery that we don't have that prosecution expertise on the GAP, this would be looking to the GAP to identify a person who can come in and join in along the process. Sorry, big one. Tasking the SSC with elaborating on improved communications with the Council regarding BSIA determinations. That was a bullet directly from the SSC and so that's just tasking back to them to put more detail to what that would look like in their view. And then moving down, I think we're now in the long term things hopefully. I'm still talking. Can you scroll down on the screen? Okay, so for long term, so this is the off-ramp concept that people have been saying as we've been talking about widow for the last couple of months. The TOR, the groundfish Terms of Reference that we're going to discuss under E.7 do describe one view of what's possible for that off-ramp. So in the TOR it's discussed as ramping between changing an assessment from the

research track to the management track, or changing from one assessment type to another, but the discussions from the advisory bodies, and I think the thinking that I've heard from everyone, is that this idea of an off-ramp actually includes a lot more things that I'm detailing here. So one is the SSC did note that they would like some clarity around when a re-review of an assessment is necessary, and so I'm looking for some development of referral protocols for that. And then I think that there have been circumstances recently, I think it was redbanded, Jessi can correct me, where we stopped the assessment entirely because we did not have the data to move forward with it, and so we need to describe those kinds of situations. And then there's also the chance that an assessment might take a lot longer than we're expecting, such as widow in this case. And I think there was a lot of pressure around that process playing out to meet the spex timeline that we're on right now, but there's definitely a way that we can move forward without needing to finish up an assessment that needs a little bit more time, and so I'd like some exploration of what has happened around the country for those circumstances. And then yeah, the last thing is the plug for the data portal. I think that there are really good tools out there that we can use that can help hold the information about the process together for all of us so that we're looking at it together. I feel ridiculous plugging a tool so much, but it's really developed, like it's one of the first things I've seen developed with the Council process in mind. It's just such a specific process that we do here, you guys know this is.... nobody does this anywhere else, so to have tools that are built around it is really an interesting opportunity to explore. So that's it and I welcome conversation.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:52] Thank you Aja. I appreciate that. There's detail. Remember, this is guidance, so I want to see if there is agreement with it, questions, if there's something else to add? So Keeley Kent, then I see three hands in here. I think I know which order. Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:22:12] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Aja for the guidance, I almost said motion. Guidance. I appreciate the thoroughness of this and the opportunity to look at a bunch of pieces. Just a couple of comments back. One I'll start with, you know I really like the idea of bringing in additional industry expertise into the process. I think the GAP does a fantastic job and I think there are times where there might be one other person on the coast who's not on the GAP who might be the person that knows about redbanded rockfish, and so I appreciate that opportunity because I think being in the room really facilitates that process, right? That like as much as possible if we can direct connect people that there's a great opportunity there. Also I'm excited about the idea, and I hear you under, you know, developing this more under Special Project 1, but of having that readily available information that can be available for the STAT Team on the fishery from the fishermen on the water, right? I think like having that at the beginning of an assessment will be really helpful and so I appreciate that. That will require work from the industry, and I know they've said they're ready and willing to do that, so I'm excited to see what that looks like. In your 2027 priorities, I'll just say, you know I support what you have here on a plan for sharing assessment results with stakeholders before the STAR Panel, but just sort of caveat, right, that that to me says we need to understand the capacity. It's a Science Center discussion and a Council discussion. I appreciate the intent here and I think, you know hopefully it's fair to say there's an exploration and the hope that we can do something here, but for at least for 2027 because it's coming up, that's how we'll be pitching it. Like let's see if we can do something here and find out, but not 100% that this is definitely something we can do without having heard from those groups yet. The last thing I'll say is on the long-term priorities, I appreciate how you have framed this so I'm not suggesting you're framing this differently, but I feel obliged to just speak to this briefly. I think it is appropriate

for the Council and NMFS to provide support for SSC in exploring some of these potential iterations of an off-ramp and what that could look like. I think we just have to continue to be mindful about the unique authority vested in the SSC, right, and how we think about BSIA determinations, so I do think there are pieces there. You know the SSC has asked for policy and legal guidance, you know, kind of all along the way with widow and we've done our best to try to pull that together. I think there's a lot more there and so I support that notion. Just want to be clear, as we as a Council look at this, right, and you have it here, but I'm just reiterating that we need to be really clear on what the SSC has the unique authority to do versus what the Council does, and I have no doubt that we can make sure those lines are clear as we do this exploration. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:13] Thank you. We go Caroline McKnight, then Rebecca Lent, then Corey Ridings. So Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:25:19] Thank you Mr. Chair. And thank you for the guidance here Aja, I do appreciate it. I just want to step back a little bit and reflect on the pathway that got us here into this discussion. And I'm really channeling the idea that, you know, if it doesn't challenge you it doesn't change you. And I've appreciated very much that the last few assessment cycles have challenged us greatly and we're responding with some change, and some of that might feel a little bit uncomfortable or new or different, but where everyone has put forward I think a lot of really thoughtful and candid input on how to do that and I appreciate that greatly. So when I'm looking at the list here, I also appreciate that it's in a short term and sort of a more long term. I'm not sure exactly if the long term definition that I have in my mind is the same maybe that you're putting forward, but I'm thinking about this list very specifically in the context of the species that we just put forward yesterday I believe for our upcoming cycle, and I'm looking for what can we reasonably start working on right now to help us as we move into that. And so when I look at the long-term priority here in this first one about refining or exploring pause or off-ramp mechanisms, it would be great if we could have something like that in place before we get to STAR Panels next summer. And so at least a conversation if there was anything that we could develop so that we could all walk into those assessments with a common understanding of how we might deal with outcomes, whether they're overly optimistic, overly pessimistic, whatever it is. That is, I think, maybe a lofty goal and maybe a little bit too much in my opinion, but I do think that is important when I reflect back at lessons learned from the last two cycles. Beyond that, I am supportive of additional opportunities for our industry to engage in the assessment development process. I don't know if pre-assessment is the right term for it. I don't know if it's a workshop. I don't think it really matters. I think what's important is to focus in on the comment from the GAP, which I think Jaime was referring to, is that the loss of maybe some trust is really related to these wild variable outcomes and assessments and being heard and understanding that, and we may not be able to fix that problem here at this table but we can certainly create a way to respond to it, and so I very much appreciate the list and how we're going to accomplish that I leave to Council staff. I do want to take a moment though to recognize Keeley your comment about staffing and staffing capacity, and I do, I hear that loud and clear. I do think that at the core of what we do everything starts at ground zero with assessments. And so this to me is where we put maybe all the eggs in the basket and maybe some other things is where do make some decisions about trimming and other agenda items, but this one feels pretty significant and important. I think with that I'll pause. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:45] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:28:47] Thank you Chair, and thank you Aja for the proposal. I really did my homework on this agenda item. I read the Lynker Report. I read The NMFS Report. I sat through four hours of discussions yesterday hearing from the advisory bodies. It's all great. I was ready to come here and start talking and think about where we go with this. This is brand new. I've never seen this. Maybe I'm the only one around the table. But I really have a lot of questions and a lot of things I'd like to do. I don't think we have the luxury of time. If you could go to the top, is this the top of the document where it says long term? I'll just try to ask some questions, but I'm really at the mercy of people who have had more time to look at this. My first question is the part that's in green, sorry, the part that's the 1a, is it everything in green? Is it also the light green? There's different shades. The crosswalking is something I'm trying to do on the fly. Maybe we could just clarify that?

Pete Hassemer [00:29:46] I think that's a question Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:29:48] Yes, thank you Rebecca. And I'm sorry for not sharing this with you beforehand. I apologize, especially since you put so much effort into it. So I will try to answer as many questions as you have. For that one, with all these things it's just guidance so I'm assuming that staff will do as much as possible, but it looks from the discussion in the table like much of this was already underway. The idea of like explaining the stock assessment process, like sort of detailing what the process looks like and what the steps are from data to BSIA is a new concept that's not in the table really, but the table does discuss putting, and Aaron Berger discussed this a bit yesterday as well, but like putting a finer point on when the points for engagement are for industry as well. So what I'm hoping for is like a more plain language discussion of what the process looks like as much of what's going on in that section that's underway as possible going forward, but like if there are things that fall off that list then, you know, I'm assuming that it's just, honestly people couldn't get to that workload. But I'm hoping for as much of that item as can happen.

Rebecca Lent [00:31:06] Thank you. And I don't expect a tutorial on this, just if I had the time I would have looked at this vis-a-vis the exercise that the Council took the time to do to put those colors in. Is it in the gray or the green? And then also what the advisory body said. And if I later on sit down and go through this maybe I can see how that was from this body and this body and that body, that's what would be helpful. Let me just ask one more specific question in the long term part, please? Yeah, and I think this is related to the question about pause off-ramp, on-ramp, and again, as with others I think Keeley mentioned this, I'm always having a struggle with what should just be the stock assessment part and what should be what we do when something doesn't turn out the way we expected it. The solution is not always to go back and do another stock assessment. The solution might be to use those other tools that we're developing that give us more flexibility, so just want to make sure that that's clear. And yeah, I think that's the only questions I can ask with some understanding but I will give it a good study. I think guidance is not something that we're tied to so that's good. I just hope that in the future, especially when something is this long that I could see it, all of us could see it before we come to the table so I can make a better decision. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:32:43] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:32:48] Thank you. Thanks Aja for the guidance. There is quite a bit here. Can we go to the....wrong long term. So....oh no, sorry, I was very confused. Sorry. Down. Thank you, yes. So detailed circumstances when an assessment process should entirely halt. And this one's a little tricky for me because, you know we don't do assessments. The National Marine Fisheries Service does assessments. Their scientists do assessments. You know they're very large projects, a lot goes into that. And I'm having trouble figuring out when there would be a circumstance that wouldn't already occur, or what the Council would have input on to say when an assessment should entirely halt. So I'm struggling with that one.

Aja Szumylo [00:33:38] I just want to respond to that one in particular. I don't think that that's our determination. It sounds like, and I defer to somebody who was here through redbanded, but it sounds like that was not a Council determination that it should stop, that it was a determination from the scientific body. So I'm not, and I very much respect what Keeley said, and you know NOAA/NMFS is set up the way it is, so sort of firewall the scientific body and the management side, and I think we have to do that same honoring and the Act has some really clear descriptions of like what the responsibility of the SSC and those bodies are compared to us, so I'm not thinking that that's our determination. I do have the sense from sitting through the process this year though that, especially with update assessments too and like what I heard with widow, and I think this was the experience actually on the management side too. I'm not trying to bring management into this, but I think when we're encountered with something strange we forget the menu of items that we have available to us to make different decisions. And so what I'm trying to do is get the menu, like make sure we come into the room with the menu of like, if this doesn't go the way we planned we're not scrambling to rush through an assessment process to get to the spex cycle. We're not bound to taking....like I think we made... I think we get on the path to going through the assessment cycle and then forget that we....there are things available to us if things don't match what we're expecting, if it's not just like a smooth process where we like are all okay with how it's going. And so I'm trying to just get the possibilities and the ways that other regions have approached things, the way that we've approached things in this region out on the table so that we know that we, like that we quickly remember that we have ways to move through confusing situations.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:41] Okay, and maybe if I can add to that at this point, the process. Excellent question to show those areas where there are concerns. As I said this is a two-meeting process and I just want to interject, and I'll confirm with Dr. Perry, but when staff puts all this together they will work with NMFS too on whatever you see again so some of these things about who does what can be covered early in the phase, so just want to note that. So Corey, please con....Corey Ridings and then Corey Niles. Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:00:00] Okay, thanks Pete for saying that. I think for me I'm trying to kind of 'better get intent' at this phase so that Council staff and NMFS aren't spinning their wheels too much before they come back to us. And so, to that point, and just thanks for explaining some of that. I agree with I think most of what you said if not all of it and certainly Keeley's earlier conversation. That firewall for me is really, really critical. It is like the core, core, core of what we do here, and so keeping that firewall between science and management and being very explicit about where those things are I think is incredibly important. So I have a little bit of a follow-up question I think for you then, which is, given what you just said, which was kind of what was in

my head too, you kind of start up, to me this whole thing is going back to this recommendation that Lynker made and the SSC endorsed around a technical referral protocol, which is very much not about the management response, which is what I just kind of heard you talking to, and is really about getting to make sure we have really, really good stock assessments. And when we see an assessment come through our process, which we are hopefully improving to have additional forms of information coming in, thinking about that, more transparency, right-sizing some of the way we do these assessments, it is still a NMFS product. So I'm struggling a little bit with, again, like what would this.....when a assessment should entirely halt still to me remains to be a stock assessor decision. If for whatever reason the technical aspects are not meeting their own sort of technical criteria for something that they would show to us, and frankly I would expect any sort of NMFS scientist would do that, would kind of pull the plug themselves and say, we just couldn't accomplish this. So anyway, so if there's still a difference between what I'm seeing there I just want to ferret that out a little more.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:03] And can we pause there. Keeley, did you want to add anything to that?

Keeley Kent [00:02:07] Well I was wondering if I gave you an example Corey of how I've thought of this, if that would help. I do think...I think there are two different things that we're talking through. One is sort of maybe being more clear about our existing opportunity when we have an assessment in hand to do further reviews and the situations in which we want to do that and what that looks like, right? I do think, you know, because this originated back with the last time we talked about the TOR when we first started talking about off-ramps, I agree that we need to be really careful, right? And hopefully my remarks there meant that. And so I think some of this exploration is trying to get at that. What are the scenarios where we would have an off-ramp? What does that mean? What does it look like? How would you know? I do think it's a science-driven decision. The thing, the... so I don't think we've ever done this, so the redbanded example, we didn't actually start a redbanded assessment. It was driven by a realization that we were not going to have the data that we needed so we switched course, but I could see that happening. One would think it would be a rare situation, right? But you start the process of we're going to start assessing it. You're depending on perhaps a key data source, perhaps an ROV survey, and then all of a sudden that data isn't going to be available. It isn't going to be ready for you to use in that assessment and you have a fundamentally different suite of information to use to assess. That is a science-driven determination. We've dealt with similar things like that in the past, but we haven't had a clear off-ramp that that, yes, you can stop in the middle and what does that mean? And so I think that is like a scenario that I would be thinking about. It's not something you would think would occur commonly, but there's the possibility that that happens where we're dependent on a particular dataset and it just simply isn't available on the timeline that we thought it was going to be. So I think that when I think about this, I think agree, we need to be really careful. But I do think there are examples that, and if we have that clarity on our process and what happens if and where we go when, that's where I think we could have some opportunity. So yeah, I agree with our Chair. I think the idea would be that we're going to do some exploration and then come back and have that opportunity to say, yes, this is what we thought we were going to be able to do and what it would look like, or no. And so I think, you know, your comments are well taken that I agree we need to be careful how we set this up and be clear on expectations.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:31] Thank you. Corey Ridings, a follow-up? No, you still have the floor.

Corey Ridings [00:04:40] Okay, thank you. Sorry about that. Thanks Keeley for the explanation. I understand that. I understand we still have room to go on this so I will just say I still have some heartburn on that. I really feel that that should be frankly just inherent in the work that NMFS does, and if it's not that's a problem. So I think that it should be every stock assessment that they come out with if something goes wrong halfway through, I would really hope that whatever that was, if the data source fell apart or something happened that, you know, the plug would be pulled and that we would get a very clear communication from those folks on why. And we're human, you know, boats don't make it out. We have extenuating budget circumstances that everyone's facing. So I guess for me that's something that I'm seeing just inherent there. But Keeley I appreciate your comments. That's just my view and we'll look forward to sort of seeing this move forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:43] Corey Niles. Then I'm going to have to pivot to the left, I have two hands there, and I'll try and go back and forth. So Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:05:51] Yeah, I think....I was going to say, and this is where I think you try to get....just clarifying again, the way the....I have stuff to say on the substance, but right now what I see, I think we're getting into the details too much. This is a first meeting we've....everyone's seen this. So, but the short-term stuff is going to go either into the Terms of Reference or this next step that Pete clarified with Diana. Then all this other stuff is going to come back and we're going to get feedback from everybody and decide where it gets chunked off into, right? And so that's kind of what we were trying to get at yesterday. So this off-ramp thing, to me that's almost a risk management type topic. So I think that's the next step we're going to figure out whether, one, get feedback on whether these are the right topics. Two, where to really have the discussion in detail, right? So I think those are the steps in my head which helps me, and if I have those wrong like where do we need to get into the discussion? But right now, yeah, this is why we don't do things in one meeting. But we have had off-ramps. I don't know that we've....yellowtail south made it all the way to the STAR Panel on day 2 and it's like now this isn't working. So the question is really, for them, the SSC always, is this going to be better than having what we had before? Which is the question that they always struggle with. But anyway, so now I'm getting into the details too, but I just wanted to clarify with the staff or the Chair of like, this is....so we got stuff going to the TOR tomorrow, shorter term stuff coming in the next stage, and then these longer term priorities that we're really going to get feedback on and figure out to take up next in some kind of planning. Is that, do I have the steps right?

Pete Hassemer [00:07:35] I believe the steps are right. I'll just....and Dr. Perry confirms and I appreciate that comment. Again, this is an important discussion. We have the guidance, that haven't heard any real changes to it, but the discussion is important to staff to be able to build the next product and hear that. So Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:07:57] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. Corey already mentioned I think that they have paused assessments before. I think south yellowtail rockfish. It think...I believe sand dabs I believe has happened before I believe, so that's not....there's off-ramps there. I'm just thinking about this last couple of cycles ago, whatever, when we had a delay in implementing quillback. In that time period we caught sixty-some percent of the estimated biomass before we could implement it, and it's pretty apparent to everybody around this table that we knew that wasn't

right, but we still went forward with it even though we objected to it. We had to go with it and we closed the fishery down and we should never have done that. And the resulting assessment after that with more information, more vetting, proved that we were accurate, and that didn't help all the people who got shut down, and so I think that's what we're trying to do so that doesn't happen in the future. I just want to comment on to the STAR Panel comment that Lynn had earlier. The original STAR Panels, GAP, and GMT were voting members, the original one, but that only lasted for a cycle or two and that was it. So it just was.... we've regressed from there. I do like, for the most part, thank you Aja. It seems to me that I think we ought to encourage, I think we need to encourage members of the stock assessment team to go out on a boat and make a trip. I remember that Phil Anderson went out on our friend Kevin Dunn's vessel and learned so much for a couple days on the water. And there's so many nuances that you can't.....you can paint a picture, but when you actually live it, when you can actually..... somebody tell you how something works and then try to....but you don't really learn by doing that, you learn by you doing it yourself. I think just the....a couple days on the water would be very valuable in every stock assessment team to have that experience because there's a lot of nuances to fishing that no one ever really gets to. I think when they go on a vessel it needs to be somebody who has been around a while, informative, a well-run operation, someone who has a history that could impart that knowledge that's been gained over decades and to enrich what we got here. I'm really happy with the Friday calls, the stock assessment calls that have been handled here recently. I think it's a great way to outreach what they're doing, but I think to really find out what we're doing and really understand the fishery, I think we ought to encourage that for every stock assessment. And I think....I don't know how...you can't.....I don't think this should be a requirement per se, but I think we should heavily encourage that, and I think it'd make a far, far better product than we got. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:22] Thank you. Lynn Mattes. No? Anything else here?..(off-mic comment)...I know, but as soon as I turn my head somebody else raises their hand. So Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:11:35] Thank you. Mr. Pettinger touched on what I....part of what I was going to say was, you know, yes there have been times that STAR Panels have recognized that they need to stop and but there's different SSC members and different STAR Panel members and that opportunity and that knowledge is not universal, and so having the menu of things that they can look at and consider instead of when it's becoming kind of crisis mode or panic mode I think is incredibly helpful and it's not for us to do. That's I think the important part. It's giving....it's empowering this group, giving them all the...like, I mean I doubt it's probably even going to be all the options, but a wide array of options of what they can do because often we hear, well according to the TORs we can only do this or we must stay within these parameters or we must do this. And if it's ambiguous there seems to be a, unless it's explicit, there's not a willingness to kind of venture out. And so if we can give them the tools and options that are available to them, I think that would be helping them and not for us to do. And so I really appreciate that. And then I just, I heard what Miss Lent said and that she had done some work coming up with ideas, and I don't know if it's appropriate or not, but to ask if she might, you might be interested in sharing some of your guidance. I don't if we can add on to Aja's guidance or have another opportunity for Miss Lent to share her thoughts?

Pete Hassemer [00:13:24] Well, we're in the process here of providing guidance so that's at any time. But I think Corey Niles, did you have your hand up? And try and go in order, hands are going up, and then I'll look back to my left.

Corey Niles [00:13:39] Yeah, I said I had comments on the substances. I just want to get the process right. And yeah, wanting to hear Dr. Lents ideas too, but I think this is....I mean I'm hoping that we, this is just step one in what's going to be a long process. And yeah, I think you're not alone in not being able to follow all this and what comes next. But the....it's a big, but the.....she didn't say it so I'm going to steal it from her, but Aja has been describing the Lynker Report and this whole process using the analogy of marriage counseling. And I was like, oh yes that makes sense. I think we had a run of assessment cycles where we got nothing but good news, and then the last three or so cycles where we got really tough, tough news. Yeah, I mean I think 2009 was my first cycle too so I have similar memories to Lynn, but we had a lot of bad news back.... not as bad as when Brad started, but so some of us have seen this a long time. And so, yeah, I can't really collect all my thoughts right now, but this, to me this is going to be a long, a long discussion. And going back to what....I was not at the table of the last discussion, but making hard choices on what's most important to do. And I think Caroline said it, I mean we can fix this process or make it better, but the fundamental issue is it's not going to fix the fundamental issue of the variability uncertainty in our assessments, and it doesn't seem like that's going away. And maybe when we get to this a couple steps down the line, maybe our time is best spent there trying to, like Keeley said is like, some of this is about management response. A lot of it is about management response. Yeah, so to try to wrap it up, if we're going to fix something it's best.... yeah it is, step one in marriage counseling is probably to hear each other and feel listened to and all that, but eventually we got to get to the, eventually we got to get....I don't mean to be just joking about that, but eventually you've got to get to what needs to be fixed or improved, and I don't know that we've got there yet. Yeah, I'll try to end it here with, I again had similar experiences to Lynn as being felt like treating as a quote unquote manager at the STAR Panels and everything I would say would be taken with, you know, with skepticism. But since then every single one of the assessment people we have in the cycle, if you go up and ask them a question, you're like how could this possibly be true. I don't understand it. And you go to them with humility and wanting to understand, they're going to try to explain it to you. And so that's really where I'm coming from. And I saw the commitment from both sides to keep communicating. I was hearing answers that other people maybe weren't hearing just only because of doing this so long, but yeah, so it really is that communication. And I forgot to thank Aja for putting this together and everyone who worked on it, but I think it's getting us there, keeping the core of the process while improving the communication. And I think that the one step is that I really, I've always been frustrated myself by is this, you got the pre-assessment workshop where you have no idea what to care about. The assessment comes out two weeks before a STAR Panel and then you start to see what's important. You get to the STAR Panel and they're like, it's too late. We can't deal with it. And that's not just an industry thing, that's a state agency thing. Like why did you use this historical data series? I've gotten in plenty of arguments about that and being told it's too late. Getting that presentation and then get people thinking before the STAR Panel I think is a really....that's a really maybe low hanging fruit that would have a lot of benefit. Went on longer there so now I will stop talking so I can hear Dr. Lents ideas.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:58] Well, I just want to have a check. We're looking for guidance. We have some here before us. I haven't heard disagreement, but we've had a lot of discussion that'll help

staff to shape that. And I don't want to cut off additional guidance, so let's make sure, you know, we can build on this. So Dr. Lent, I'm not sure if you raised your hand or not, but people are forcing you to.

Rebecca Lent [00:18:27] Thank you Chair. That's what I get for complaining. But I would just say that I didn't have a proposal. If I'd had one I would have shared it. But my focus was on taking the next step after what we got from the Council staff. We're already doing this. Let's make sure we do it. Here's the stuff that's relatively easy to do, let's try a couple of them for 2027. There are some things in the list that I'm not comfortable with, but that's okay, this is guidance. Let's go forward and, yeah, I just hope next time I can see it sooner. I think I can be more efficient at the table here and provide some constructive background. So thank you Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:08] All right, thank you. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:19:11] So I'll have everyone know I made a table before this meeting lining out the Council tasks and then like trying.....I wanted to like assign motions to people and like make sure that we were all sharing with each other and then, so this feels extra sad that I like failed at sharing because I tried so hard so I'm so sorry about that. I do....I want to say that I was cross-referencing. So I was trying intentionally to leave the things out of the Lynker report that suggested a lot more meetings. Those are largely the things that I left off were like the red item things that were like, add two more pre-assessment workshop meetings. I think that Keeley would have yelled at me. Somebody else would have yelled that additional meetings was not the right approach. And then I looked at the Terms of Reference.....yeah, so I'm just telling methodology of how I got to this too. I looked to the Terms of Reference and a lot of, and some of what Corey was saying too is that, and Keeley also said this, we have 17 other items that are going on that are covering different aspects of things that came up in the Lynker discussion. And so it's been really difficult to kind of, to pull out pieces that are ongoing already that we're going to pick up in risk management that are.... yeah, that don't have a home. And so what this list ended up as is things that I saw that were in the link that came out of the Lynker discussion and the advisory body advice that weren't too cumbersome and that were not already included in the Terms of Reference. So it's trying to capture the lingering things that didn't have the location. But I also....yeah, I'm open to....you know this is not....it's just guidance, it's not...I am not wedded to any of it, I'm just trying to provide a framework. So I welcome other people's thoughts. I also really like, as someone who's shifted from NOAA to industry and learned a whole lot in that leaving, I think, I honestly think that we should all be doing cross-details with each other. Like I think NOAA should go work at the states. I think the state should go work in industry. I think we should know each other's jobs so that we're kinder to each other, and I don't think that there's a place for that agenda item, but....

Butch Smith [00:21:32] Take your Councilman to work....(laughter)...

Aja Szumylo [00:21:32] Yes, I think we should all do more cross-learning. I think that that's a really....and I guess that came up in the MREP kind of discussions too. So, but yeah, this is all to say like this is not, like, I think we have 17 other places to pick this up or other aspects of this up later on. So, also reduce workload. Thanks..

Pete Hassemer [00:21:55] All right, thank you. On the guidance, I think Brad Pettinger had his hand up. Then I'm going to give a warning to Dr. Perry there that I'm going to look for kind of a summary and then see what more we need here. So Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:22:16] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. Could we scroll up to the short-term priorities? I just want to make sure I get this. You know a lot of times the data stays the same but assumptions change. I think it would be good if key assumptions were identified going into assessments so people understand, or which ones are changing, because I think about the canary assessment for instance, right? The assumption was that there's old females but we're not catching them because we're not serving where they live and we're not fishing, we can't fish in those grounds. The assessment team comes in, they say, well they must be dying because we're not seeing them. So obviously I don't see anything come out on a whim, but there was an assumption made. One was viable, was good enough in 2015 and one's good enough in 23'. They both....I was going to say they're both equivalent. I'd like to know more about why that was the case, and I think the Council should....I think depending on how much went into that, it would be really interesting to know what it took to do that to make a decision given the gravity of what it changed in the fishery. There's big assumptions that make a big difference. I think we need to understand that, and so I think that would be my big wish out here. I will say this, two or three cycles ago we had no interaction with the fishing industry and the folks that were in the Science Center. I mean, so we've been on the right track here. We're doing better, right? But we continue, we need to.....we only get one bite at this thing before it gets to us and we need to do everything we possibly can to make that the very best possible product for the people who we represent. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:11] Thank you. So what we have is written, fairly extensive written guidance here. We can, and I see more hands. All right, give you more time to think there. Caroline McKnight, then Corey Ridings.

Caroline McKnight [00:24:31] Thank you Mr. Chair, I appreciate that. And in Freaky Friday job switch, Keeley and I are definitely switching seats....(laughter)....But I just wanted to I guess ask a clarifying question or just somebody reaffirm for me my understanding of this list of guidance, which is that this is a very specific and judiciously picked list that is in front of us. It doesn't mean that when we hear about this again, which I believe is November, that anything else on the list that was put forward by the ABs or in the staff report couldn't be brought back, and I just want to make sure that, you know for Rebecca's sake or others that maybe think that there are things that missing that, that yes, we're coming back to this but some of these may be a no-go. We might hear that it's too much workload or it can't be compensated for in some way and so we can pick up others, and that was a hundred percent my intent of what is in front of us. So I just want some confirmation on the table that everyone is thinking the same thing. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:34] Well I think you're right, but I'm going to ask Dr. Perry there, because as you said, this is a longer process. So Diana.

Diana Perry [00:25:44] Thank you Chair. Yes, this will be at least one other meeting, maybe two. We are really hoping though, particularly for the longer term items, this may be in March of 27' that we're able to come back with you, to you, excuse me, with a plan on how we might try to accomplish those actions. So this is sort of a not, I'm going to say first cut, but we're not necessarily

cutting things out. It's more of a can we try to find items to focus on and that focus may shift when we have that conversation in November, but we want to make sure that when we are coming back in March we have focused on those longer term items and can come to you with a plan on how to accomplish those, particularly the longer term ones.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:31] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:26:34] Thanks, I guess this is guidance. It's just not written verbal guidance. I would like to see as part of sort of the next steps thinking about the full continuum of stock assessment methods. Given conversations that we've had around the Council I think that that is something that we are going to be looking at. I get the sense that the National Marine Fisheries Service is already looking at this and that it's something that's already on the table, but I just wanted to sort of give that a verbal and public wholehearted endorsement is something that I think we need to be doing. So as part of that, I.....the 10-year plan that we saw from NMFS as part of our 20....oh, I'm already forgetting the agenda item, whatever it was, the 10-year plan around stock assessment, I think that that was a really quality product. We've already talked about that but I think those things relate to each other in the sense that as we strategically think about doing our stock assessments and doing them in a way that's responsive to industry needs and within a budget-constrained environment that needs to be done in connection. So I think that those are threads we can put together later, but I did want to put those here and just make sure that full continuum of stock assessment methods is put into that. Two relatively minor things, but I'm hearing a lot, and I think a lot of this is around public communication and inclusion, MREP has been brought up a couple times including by the SSC. While that content may be fantastic, it's still private and it's still not....even for folks that can go it's not available to a large range of people. So there are people who will not benefit from that. So I think it would say, let's think of MREP plus plus and think of other tools, whether that's like the lectures and the activities and the materials that are part of the MREP, maybe those are made publicly available. You know, maybe they're put on YouTube, you know, or maybe they're just other products altogether, but ways to take the information that's contained in that and have that more available to other people who can't travel or are not picked to be part of it. So I think that's really important. And just my very small last thing, but noticing one of the Lynker recommendations under transparency was develop and maintain audience specific communication tools that explicitly support the non-fishing community. And that was interesting, I mean we just think of the main audience as a fishing industry audience, and even as someone who used to work in the conservation community, I still think of the main people we are working with is fisherman. But I think it is really important to think of anybody who's non-fishing also as an audience and one that may also need different communication products to help effectively participate in the fisheries governance process. And I see that it's Council staff has kind of moved that into an above item that is already being done because it's dark green. Thank you Dr. Perry again for this really nice spreadsheet, but just noting that I think that that would be helpful if we want to bring folks who are not fishing into this fold and we want do it in the most inclusive, successful way possible, but thinking about their needs too is important. So that's it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:48] Thank you. So I heard there's some additional guidance there. You talked about consideration of the full continuum of stock assessments that everybody is comfortable with that. So let me turn to Dr. Perry, and again, I was going to say we have fairly descriptive written guidance before us. We could treat that as a motion. We've had a lot of

discussion that will help staff consider the Council's intent and the desire on that to put into a product that we will see in November. So Diana, maybe you can just summarize what you've heard and the process forward?

Diana Perry [00:30:37] Yes Chair Hassemer, I will try my best to summarize the discussion very briefly. Overall, I did not necessarily hear any objections to the motion brought by Aja, but I did hear the three additions from Council member Ridings. I did also hear some hesitation specifically around the on and off-ramps. All of that has been noted, and where needed we will be working with obviously the SSC, the STAR Panels and NMFS to try and work through some of those challenges. I have also heard that the learning across the industry and the Council as well as staff would probably be helpful, but we may not have the capacity to do that. But that is sort of a very, very quick summary of your great detailed discussion. Next steps forward, we will be bringing back what we can in November and that will hopefully help us move forward with any additional long term items that we may need to identify and bring back for March of 27'.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:53] All right, thank you. And just a reminder, it's not a motion, guidance here that you have. And does that sound complete? Is there more? And I think, as was pointed out, this does not set anything in stone. You're going to have another chance to look at this, add, subtract, whatever you want to do. So if not, I want to make sure we've captured all the guidance, there is quite a bit there. And if we're good to proceed then, I will close this agenda item.

4. Final Stock Assessment Plan for 2027, Preliminary Priorities for 2029 and Beyond

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] All right, that completes our reports and the public comment, takes us to our Council task, consider the information and recommend a final list of species. And a third item, comments on the preliminary 10-year plan. And we do need, at least for the Item Number 2, a motion at some point. So who wants to start? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:30] Thank you Chair. And I do have a motion when we get there. Appreciate the information we've had, we've received, and the dialogue, the answers to questions that Dr. Marshall provided. I have hope that this new 10-year process will benefit us in the long run but it's going to take some resources to begin with. You know part of the.....one of the reasons that stock definitions and removing a bunch of species out of the groundfish FMP, one of the reasons expressed for that is we don't have the capacity to do the assessments on everything. Even with removing all of the species, moving a bunch to EC species, there's still a number of species that we are overdue for. So being cognizant of the staffing, workload, and considerations with NMFS, I'm a little uncomfortable that we're only going to do four benchmark assessments this cycle. Hopefully by sacrificing approximately a third of our STAR Panel capacity this cycle that we'll be spending that time wisely to set ourselves up to be more efficient in the future. Appreciate the GAP, the GMT, and the SSC all basically coming to agreement on most things and I will be using their recommendations in my motion when it becomes time, so thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:05] Thank you Lynn. Let me see if there's other comments. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:02:10] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. Thanks Lynn for those thoughts. Would it be okay to ask Dr. Marshall one more question that came up from the advisory body statements if she's available? Or Shantel?

Pete Hassemer [00:02:23] Sure. Dr. Marshall, are you still online?

Kristin Marshall [00:02:30] Yes sir, I am.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:32] All right, Corey, you want to go ahead?

Corey Niles [00:02:35] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair, thanks Kristin. My question's on shortspine and the GAP statement about doing an update without the age data. Well I have some comment on the aging capacity in a second, but did you...so that is correct that you checked with the states about shortspine and there won't be enough capacity to read otoliths for that stock if we were to recommend an update? And then part....the second part of that, if true, then what data actually goes in, would it go into the update, new data? Thank you.

Kristin Marshall [00:03:20] Thanks for the question Mr. Niles. Through the Chair, yeah, so for shortspine we have never been able to age that species, so the 2023 assessment was based on length composition data. The only aging information that exists to my knowledge is from a small study in Alaska that they've used to try to pin down the maturity at age curve, but it's not.....they're not

able to age them well enough to use them in a production stock assessment up there either. So that's just going to be an ongoing limitation and that's just true for some of our species. And then your second part was what else was in the 2023 stock assessment? I might turn to Chantel, Dr. Wetzel to see if she can help me out with that.

Chantel Wetzel [00:04:12] Thank you for the question. The 2023 assessment included fishery catches, indices of abundance from each of the federal trawl surveys with the Northwest Center bottom trawl survey being quite informative in terms of the index, along with link compositions from the fishery and the survey. An update in 2025 would update data sources for the last, it'll be now 4 years in 2027, to provide an updated stock status and catch limits for shortspine.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:51] Is that good Corey?

Corey Niles [00:04:53] Yeah Mr. Chair, thanks. Just quickly, yeah I knew there was something odd about shortspine, but I forgot there was no age reading at all in there, so I appreciate that and thank you both for the answer.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:05] Thank you. Any other discussion? Otherwise, we do have.....Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:05:11] Yeah, just quickly looking forward to Lynn's motion, but I just want to make.....in Lynn's comment about removing stocks from the FMP and saving, theoretically saving work but still having too much, I just want to pass along a comment. We have a working group with some folks, it's just informal with the 3 west coast states and some folks from Alaska even, and you know it's come up there in that forum that, you know, if there were a nearshore.... you know reading otoliths is done by the states and the feds, and one person there remarked, you know, if I was....if there was a nearshore species needing to be assessed that would be my priority and I can't, I couldn't read otoliths for the federal species, so I'm just....this is a reality that we're going to have to deal with and yet still skeptical that stock definitions, it didn't.....is going to save that work, it's maybe just displaced it. But I just wanted to.... yeah, the states might not be there to read these otoliths if we're doing our own stock assessments.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:24] Thank you. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:06:26] Thank you. Comments on the change to the one meeting process. I hear hesitancy in the GAP Report. They're trying to....it seems like they're trying to straddle it in their statement. They're saying, well, you know maybe do it in April or even years so we could follow-up in June if there's a problem, but if we're doing it in April we're probably adopting an FPA at that point. I don't know how that would work to then have a second swipe in June. And I feel like I've heard a few different.....in the ABs the other day, just concern about the idea, at least right out of the gate, going to a one meeting. And so I would, in my opinion, maybe keeping it at two meetings. I can't think of a time where the initial list matched what actually happened and so doing that in one swipe, because conversations happen, there's the talking with the centers and talking with industry about what the needs are with what we first come up with versus the reality, and I have concern about going to a one kind of right out of the gate. I recognize the point of the 10-year plan is to have those ideas already going, but I feel like that's going to change as well and

not necessarily what we're looking at right now be what ends up down the line. So I just....I have a lot of hesitation on moving that to a one meeting process. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:01] Thank you. I don't see any other hands. Lynn, or Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:08:07] Yeah, at your preference Mr. Chair, but yeah Jaime's comment on Number 3 I had some thoughts too, but if you wanted to proceed in order. I'm guessing Lynn is.....you wanted the motion on Number 2, but I can hold off on Number 3 if you want to go to Number 2 first.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:27] Let's take Number 2 first and then see what comes out of that and we've got plenty of time then to finish up that discussion. So Lynn, are you ready?

Lynn Mattes [00:08:37] Thank you Chair. Yes, I believe the tower has the document from me. I move the Council adopt the species assessment type and assessment area or areas in Table 1 below as the Final Preferred Alternative list for 2027 assessments, noting that there are more catch-only projections listed than may be possible, therefore they are listed in priority order as recommended by the GAP. Then if in Table 1, benchmark assessments would be: Lingcod - North and South. Yellowtail - South, and redbanded - Coastwide. Update assessments: Petrale sole and shortspine thornyhead - Coastwide. Catch-only projections: Canary - Coastwide. California scorpionfish - California. Darkblotched rockfish - Coastwide. Cowcod - South of 40°10'. Sablefish - Coastwide. Yellowtail - North of 40°10'. And widow - Coastwide. And the preliminary species for potential benchmark assessments and anticipated assessment area or areas in Table 2 below for 2029 assessments, acknowledging that the current list contains more assessments than there is capacity and will need to be culled at a later date based on data and age structure availability. So for 2029 the proposed list of possible assessments: Black rockfish - Oregon and Washington. Bocaccio - Coastwide. Darkblotched - Coastwide. Shortspine thornyhead - Coastwide. Spiny dogfish shark - Coastwide. Vermilion/sunset rockfish - North and South of 40°10'. And widow rockfish - Coastwide. Thank you. I forgot about that part. Additionally, have Council staff work with NMFS Science Center staff to determine which assessments should occur at which STAR Panel based on the assessor being assigned to the assessment, data deadlines, and age-reading needs. And we can skip the guidance part, that's going to come later.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:03] All right, while he types that, I followed along. What was on the screen appeared accurate and complete, is that correct?

Lynn Mattes [00:11:12] Yes sir, it was.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:13] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Brad Pettinger. Go ahead and speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:11:18] Thank you sir. As we heard a few moments ago, the SSC, the GAP, and the GMT were pretty much in alignment on the assessment, the assessment types, and the assessment areas for benchmark, update, and catch-only assessments for 2027. So having lingcod north and south, that's probably going to be one STAR Panel and I would anticipate yellowtail and redbanded would be a second one. And then based on the discussion about shortspine, an update

at this time seemed a more appropriate than a full new benchmark. There are more catch-only updates listed than can be accomplished. I've heard somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 might be possible and this list currently has 7. So the order they are listed here is the same order from the GAP Report and the GAP recommendations such that yellowtail north and widow would be the lower priority if we cannot get to them. Then for 2029, the list is longer than we would have a capacity even with three full STAR Panels. I was seeing this sort of as a range of alternatives to get the discussion going. We've got a little bit of time for the Science Centers to come....states, whoever, to come to us with where we would data, where we might have age reading, where there might be some limitations. I do know that the black rockfish off Oregon assessment is somewhat tied to the action we have taken under stock definitions. There may be a way.....that may not have to go through our regular STAR Panel process. We're still discussing that between NMFS and ODFW. And the rest are just based on the information we've received about data availability. And I put the caveat there at the end to allow NMFS and Council staff to figure out who's doing which assessment and which STAR Panels are being conducted when and where. I think I've spoken enough about that given the time of the day. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:28] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:13:39] Just briefly, thanks Lynn, and echoing Lynn's thanks to all the good discussion from the Science Center and staff and GAP and GMT and support the motion. And yeah I felt a little bit silly asking my question to GMT a bit ago about yellowtail, reminding that we're talking about 2029 here and like, oh yeah, why are we talking about 2029 when it's so far away. But the point is to give extra time to work on the things that take a long time. And going back to my Q&A with Dr. Marshall about spiny dogfish, we are seeing....the science is telling us there are some concerning signs north Pacific-wide, and I'll just add to the hope in supporting this motion. The hope is I hope the Science Centers will continue looking at that tagging data and whatever they can do to prepare themselves for taking some of the trans-boundary issues into account in 2029. With that thought, I'll just yes, again, in support of the motion and thanks to everyone for all the effort and to Chantel and team in particular for all putting all that together, it's a lot of work.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:53] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:14:53] Given the hour, I apologize for this, but is the vermilion/sunset break not the right one? Aren't we broken at 42° on vermilions/sunset? No?

Pete Hassemer [00:15:08] Jessi.

Jessi Waller [00:15:08] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, thanks Miss Kent. I had missed this earlier, but you are correct. I just confirmed with the FMP, and Todd just yelled at me from behind me, that we are at north and south of 42° for vermilion/sunset.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:28] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:15:29] Would that be necessary Mr. Chair? Would that be considered a technical correction or a substantive that would need an amendment to my motion?

Pete Hassemer [00:15:39] I'm going to call it a technical correction. It's simply the wrong latitude.

Lynn Mattes [00:15:49] I am perfectly acceptable with that. I suspect my motion seconder would also be good with that? Brad? So, if the tower could correct that to north and south of 42° North latitude, get rid of the 10. And apologies for not catching that. A product of too many things going on.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:14] And now make sure with you and with our staff officers that is correct for vermilion/sunset? I see head nods, good. Other discussion? Seeing none I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:16:36] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:36] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:16:48] Thank you Chair. I do have some guidance written out that I think will spur the discussion that Mr. Niles was starting to get to under Action Item 3. If the tower could scroll down, since it is just guidance, but I wrote it down just to help spur discussion. Asking the Science Center staff to continue to develop the long-term assessment plan and streamline incorporating the recommendations from the SSC, GAP, and GMT. And then in regards to the proposal to shift from a two-to-one meeting for the stock assessment plan, ask Council staff to consider feedback from the GAP and GMT and get feedback from the SSC and bring back to the Council for further consideration at a future meeting. I think some of us are still a little concerned or question the need for this piece, so throwing these out there to help spur the discussion on that Action Item 3.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:51] All right, thank you. I'm going to turn to Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:17:58] Caroline was going to.....I haven't had a chance....you can go first.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:03] Caroline McKnight, without raising your hand you've been called.

Caroline McKnight [00:18:07] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Mr. Niles. I thank you Lynn for the guidance here. I just wanted to add a little bit of, I guess, more context to the first bullet here. I am supportive of this 10-year plan. I fully understand all the reasons why we're doing this and setting it up in a way that helps plan better, account for staffing capacity better, all of those things. I think I'm still a little bit unclear of how and when we might come back to this plan if we, if our needs change? And I think that dovetails into the second bullet where having a second meeting at some point, or at least the possibility of one, can allow us to make modifications as needed. And I'm channeling, you know, it's like we don't know what we don't know, and we don't know if, you now, vermilion needs to stay on that line item or be folded back into the shelf rotation or others need to rotate back, and so I know there's probably more coming in November to understand when

and how those things will happen, so I'm just, I guess, providing some context for more information later that might be needed to help understand how this mechanism's going to work. But as it's presented right now I think it's a good step forward and I appreciate you putting it together. Thank you Lynn.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:29] Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:19:31] Yeah, thanks. Very similar to Caroline, but I'm maybe in....I thought what I heard from Jessi when I asked the question of Dr. Marshall just is, we're....this is the first time people have seen this and it's, maybe it's a new trend that we're trying to do things in one meeting now, but this is a big, somewhat of a first. Supportive of the concept for sure, but yeah, the details, I don't know if they've sunk in to a lot of us. So I thought I heard we were going to come back in March or November. You just....you guys said it and in one ear out the other ear, but what I heard was there's going to be another opportunity for us to like give feedback. I almost spoke up....as an example, I almost spoke up on the vermillion part of the motion because the bigger issue there is like are we really defining the stock boundaries at this time? I'm hoping not because I understood when we did that that there's opportunity when the new data comes in to consider whether those are the right boundaries or not, and I think, you know, how does that relate to the vermillion in Washington and Oregon? So there's all kinds of questions that will come up, is my point here, the details, and we can't decide it all 10 years ahead of time. So yeah, definitely one other thing is all these other moving pieces about improvements to the stock assessment process, is that not going to maybe change our schedule idea here and some of these maybe quicker methods? So there's a lot of in the air that we're still trying to piece together and going to talk about again tomorrow. So yeah, just adopting a 10-year plan after seeing it for one time that's not how this, you know, I'm hating....the younger me wouldn't hate the older me for saying this, but that's not how we've done things at this Council in one meeting. But Jessi I think you're going correct me if I got the next step wrong, but those are my over.....a good idea, but I think more feedback is needed on the questions that Lynn and Caroline and others have, and Jamie brought up, but thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:31] Okay, Rebecca before I get to you I want to turn to Jessi. I think this is a good time because our third task there is just provide comments on the preliminary 10-year plan. There have been some.....maybe a refresher on the schedule and how we'll progress?

Jessi Waller [00:21:50] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, I know there's lots of stock assessment things, especially at this meeting and overlapping with November and March, and we're throwing a lot of dates at y'all. So this is the first time....we brought up the idea of a 10-year plan in March when we did scoping, and this is a first time we're actually seeing the 10-year plan proposed by the Science Center. That is correct and looking for feedback on that. We would be bringing back the 10-year plan itself in March of 2027. And that's when we would kind of do what we do on our, like, if we were to do a two meeting process it would be kind of the....we wouldn't be officially final adoption. I think we've been like internally calling it like an interim final adoption in that we are proposing that this would be the schedule. But again, this is a living document. You are always able every biennium to make changes to the schedule and then capacity and everything else that is going on. You know I think the idea is that, and Dr. Marshall can confirm this, but you know like in two years we would need to add two more years to the schedule and you know things are going to arise. We're going to make changes. So while I don't think we want to be amending the 10-year

plan every single biennium because that kind of takes away from the efficiency of a 10-year plan, you would still have the ability that we're going to continue to use this long-term. So I hope that helps at least clear up a little bit of the process and that we're planning on hopefully taking a final look at this in March. November would just be set up, like clarifying our stock assessment process, which is not currently living in a Council Operating Procedure, and we want to make sure the public is aware of how we do this process.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:37] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:23:39] Thank you Chair, and thank you Miss Waller. That's basically the point I was going to make. I mean this report says, here's why stock assessments might need to be done. Something's happening. We're getting close to full attainment, whatever. We do our best to plan so that we can have an advanced planning mechanism, but things change and we may have to move things around. I understood it to be a living document. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:00] Thank you. Other comments? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:24:04] Yeah, let me just.....giving one more specific example. I am not, and not that I won't be convinced, but I'm not convinced, for example, that yellowtail should be on its own line and the other shelf rockfish should not. Like, is yellowtail really more important than, for example, black rockfish Washington, which would be, it will still remain in the FMP. Would it be, you know, yelloweye rockfish? I'm sure there's good reasons to think through, but yeah, at this point it wouldn't be decided.....that was one example of should we really.....yellowtail really be called out above the other shelf rockfish? Just something to think about. And yeah, thank you for the reminder this is a living plan and the next steps, that was helpful.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:45] Thank you. Any other comments on the 10-year plan or discussion regarding that? And while I'm not seeing any hands, I'm going to look to Jessi and if you can summarize what you've heard.

Jessi Waller [00:25:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll do my best at 5:30. So in terms of your tasks today, you have adopted your final list of species by assessment type for 2027 as well as a preliminary list for 2029, so that has been taken care of. In terms of providing comments on the preliminary 10-year plan and kind of the proposed new process, we have heard, you know, some comments and concerns around, you know, this is the first chance at seeing this plan. Again, we'll be coming back to this at March. I think the last thing, you know, I think Mr. Niles just spoke to is the list of species. You know I think that if the Council does have any initial considerations that the Science Center can take back with them to help develop any changes for March so species that should be considered to be on the list or frequency like such as the GAP mentioned, that could be helpful, but if you don't have those that's okay as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:06] All right, thank you. Anything else folks need to discuss here on this agenda item? And it doesn't look like it, so thank you very much for completing that. We'll close out E.4.

5. Moving Trawl Gear EFP into Regulations; Updating Declaration Requirements; Removing Duplicative Recreational Regulations

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So with that we'll ask that we see our tasks before us. See who wants to....there we are, establishing the scope of the action, adopting purpose and need. It's all up there on the screen. And remember there, I think there are 3 actions. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:00:27] Thank you. I don't want to cut off discussion, but it is super late and I have a motion when folks are ready for it.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:34] All right. Part of the motion process is having discussion, so let's have it after we hear your motion.

Aja Szumylo [00:00:45] So, I move that the Council adopt for the Trawl Gear EFP, the Purpose and Need and Range of Alternatives in Agenda Item E.5.a, Revised Attachment 1, and Alternative 1 with both Options 1 and 2 as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative. For at-sea declarations, the Purpose and Need and ROA in Agenda Item E.5.a, Revised Attachment 1 with the revision to Alternative 1 in Agenda Item E.5.a, Supplemental GAP Report Part 1. And the revised alternative as PPA. And then for recreational sale of fish waste, the Purpose and Need in Agenda Item E.5.a, Revised Attachment 1, the supplemental, or sorry, the Revised Alternative 1 in Agenda Item E.5.a, Supplemental Revised GMT Report 1. And then the revised alternatives from that document as the PPA.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:42] All right. I need to look at it. As I followed along all that language on the screen appears accurate and complete, is that correct?

Aja Szumylo [00:01:53] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:54] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Heather Hall. Please speak to your motion.

Aja Szumylo [00:01:59] Thank you. And I tried to reference the advisory body reports because they put a lot of work into thinking through these items, and so I'm sorry if it makes it a little hard to follow along with what what we're actually moving here. But for rationale, for the trawl gear, we've been testing this EFP for 9 years and have ample information to support eliminating the existing regulations that prevent this activity. These actions would improve operational flexibility for trawl participants, increase quota utilization, and then also benefit shoreside processors. And we now have environmental and biological impacts analyzed, and those are similar to what's happening without the EFP components in place. For at-sea declarations, this is another provision of operational flexibility for trawl participants to adjust their targeting strategy without needing to return to port. The small adjustment I made was to language that the GAP pointed out in their report. And then yeah, this one, it's expensive out there with fuel and so not returning to port and to be able to change a strategy out at sea is really helpful for everyone. And then for recreational fish waste, you know I hope the states can speak up. I know that there was a lot of discussion between the states to kind of piece together a alternative that would reflect the differences in how

they approach this, but overall this change would provide additional flexibility to allow for the sale of fish waste. And yeah, this is another operational flexibility issue, and I'll let others speak up for additional rationale that they want to add here for that. That's it for now.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:00] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:04:06] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Aja, and I'm assuming because really the focus of the EC Report was really more adjustments to the CFR, I assume you've kind of analyzed that the consistency and what you're proposing here in your motion and what they've offered up relative to where we'd ultimately have to go with the CFR, you know, match?

Pete Hassemer [00:04:28] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:04:31] Thank you for the question. Yes, and again, I appreciate the EC for going a step beyond what's needed at this stage, but at this point what they put forward matches what the alternative that's written in the GMT Report, or if it's the GAP Report for this one, I can't remember, sorry. The report provides some revisions, but the reg techs providing that now is....I think it's been a comforting step above and beyond for the states in considering how to create consistency with this regulation and their state regulations.

Sharon Kiefer [00:05:02] Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:05] Other questions? Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:05:08] Thank you Chair. Just a quick follow-up to that point that Miss Kiefer raised. When we looked at the GMT Report and we saw that in parentheses, i.e., entrails, skeletal remains, et cetera, it was discussed that 'ie' means 'for example', so that it could go beyond that. But in fact, my understanding is 'ie' is 'that is to say', whereas 'eg' would be 'for example'. So I just want to make sure that's clear, and I know people are probably going to talk about this whole thing about the definition so I'll just let it be, but 'ie' definitely means just these. Thank you.

Aja Szumylo [00:05:51] May I phone a friend and do you want speak to that or?

Pete Hassemer [00:05:58] Yes.

Heather Hall [00:05:58] Sure. I was just going to bring it up in discussion. Are we there? It's kind of a question.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:04] Sure, and if there's more questions we'll take them up, but go ahead.

Heather Hall [00:06:09] Thank you. Thank you Chair. And that was really exactly the reason for the question I asked of the GMT because you're exactly right on the conversation that we were thinking about there is we were hoping that the intent of the GMT, and they responded in that way, that this was really more illustrative and more in line with 'eg' than 'ie'. And that's how I heard them respond.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:42] All right, thank you. Any other questions or discuss.....Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:06:49] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Just to be explicitly clear, it's my understanding that because the EC Report is not referenced in the motion that it is your intent that the states and NMFS will continue to work on drafting and developing the language before we go final and that we are not adopting the recommended language that they are providing for us in their report, is that correct?

Aja Szumylo [00:07:23] Thank you. That's correct. Yes, I think that their exploration was comforting as we were moving forward with setting up alternatives, but it's not an adoption of that language at this moment.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:32] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:35] Thank you. Further questions, discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:43] Thank you Chair. And thank you Aja for drafting the motion and getting us going on this. I'm glad to see that we're moving forward with this. It provides some additional flexibility for our trawl fleet. The operational flexibility that we've heard as well as maybe reduce some of the workload for the Council and for NMFS, which I think is appropriate. Do appreciate the time that has been spent on recreational sale of fish waste in Oregon. A lot of the ports the fish waste goes into a dumpster and then the port has to pay to take it to the landfill, and there's interest in other things to do with it. We actually have some charter operators that save the carcasses from yesterday and use them as crab bait today. So just trying to make it so that some of the things that are happening are not illegal, that are trying to be useful with the whole product. It does have some potential for some slippery slope, but I think if we're very deliberate and careful with it we can get there. I know internally ODFW and OSP have been having a lot of conversations about definitions, and I know we'll continue to have those with NMFS and with our neighboring states. So I'm supportive of all of the things on this because I think it does help with our operations efficiencies across several sectors. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:15] Thank you. Vice-Chair Smith.

Butch Smith [00:09:19] Yeah, you know I just want to make it perfectly clear, at least Ilwaco and Westport, we're not going to stand on the back deck of our boats yelling out fish guts for sale. I can promise you that. What this is for is so we can take and utilize, not us, but we can utilize the fish. Fish pellets for salmon food, cat food, so someone else can sell those. We are not getting a dime. We're just having a location where we can put the fish and then the fish companies can go ahead and turn them into fish pellets or whatever they're going to do, and I think that's a well use of the whole fish. And it's another way it keeps the fish out of the water so we don't have seals and sea lions come into our port and end up like in East Mooring Basin Astoria. So I just want to make that perfectly clear. We're not going to be competing with Poggi and Travis on fish sales of.....you know, it ain't going to happen. We just want be able to legally get it to the barge so the fish company can dispose of them and maybe make a few shillings off of that, that's all. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:38] Thank you. Any other discussion? Marci, and then Heather. I'm not sure who's hand was first.

Marci Yaremko [00:10:52] Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to speak in favor of this motion. And I want to offer some other thank you's surrounding Parts 1 and 2 of the motion. I want to shout out to NMFS for the analysis on the EFP data that's been collected and the conclusion that they reached after a very thorough analysis that the risk of implementation of either or both of these exemptions causing the non-whiting threshold on salmon bycatch to be exceeded appears to be vanishingly low. That was very comforting so I want to thank them for that hard work. I also want to thank Lori Steele for her commitment to overseeing and implementing this EFP and getting the data from the participants and ensuring that they are following the terms and conditions. I know this has been a lot of work on them, and it has been really good work and a great example of how our process can work to provide opportunity and demonstrate that we can fish while minimizing bycatch. I want to say that when this action is finalized and we have moved, we've modified our regulations such to allow these activities and offered the flexibilities that the EFP has provided. There are not very many IQ vessels remaining in this fishery. It is very important that we do what we can to keep them operating and to provide them flexibilities like this where and when we can, particularly off Northern California. I mean this....the focus of this activity really was in this hot spot around the Klamath Management Zone, and we hope that revising the rules brings that flexibility for vessels and hopefully attracts some interest, both on the part of vessels and hopefully in processing capacity and infrastructure. That said, we do also need to be mindful of the importance of the accountability measures that the IQ program has at its core, so that is one piece I want to make sure we don't forget, and so I'm glad to see that it is incorporated into the purpose and need of this action today. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:18] Thank you Marci. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:13:20] Thank you, and I'm glad I went after Marci and I was just going to echo the comments of Butch as well. First of all here, here. This is an action really focused on moving this Trawl Gear EFP into regulation. While there was a lot of tension on the fish waste this week, that really deserves some attention and kudos for taking this next step, so well said Marci, I appreciate that. And echoing what Butch said, you said it perfectly. The intent with the fish waste is not to change any overarching policies that we have in regulation that we don't....that recreational fisher are not for sale. And just really trying to find flexibility for states that want to opt in. It's not a requirement, but a flexibility that we have to address a problem we have. So thanks for that.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:17] Thank you. Other discussion? I'm looking carefully and I'm not seeing any hands so I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:14:30] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:33] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Aja. Let's....as soon as the typing is done, get our task list up. And maybe I should ask Todd to tell us what else. We've got a lot of time left. What else should we do?

Todd Phillips [00:14:56] Thank you Mr. Chair. I don't have another PowerPoint so you're in luck. Looking at the Council tasks, you have established the scope of this particular action and you have adopted Purpose and Need Statements for each portion of the action, each one of the Action Items, and as well as you have adopted Preliminary Preferred Alternatives with some noted corrections that were based in language that was in the GMT and GAP Reports. Looking at your task list and reviewing the items that we've talked about, you have appropriately identified everything and are complete with the action at this time.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:33] Thank you. Before I close it out, let me see if there's anything else that needs to be said? It doesn't look like it so we will close that agenda item out. Thank you everyone for good work.

6. 2027-28 Harvest Specifications, Management Measures, and Exempted Fishing Permits – Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes all our reports and public comment, takes us to our action. There was a very long list. I trust you have that on your computers in front of you too on the Situation Summary. But I will look around for the first hand to start the discussion process here. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:28] Thank you Chair. A lot of work has gone into getting us here. This year, or this cycle, we did have a very limited scope on this without really being able to do many new management measures. We've had some hiccups with widow rockfish that the Science Center, the SSC, the GMT, the GAP, industry have all been plugging through. So while things may seem like they're fairly simple here today, it's due to a lot of work over the last 364 days or whatever the math is that Mr. Phillips said a few minutes ago. So I hope we remember that when we're scheduling in two years, depending on the scope of what our management measures contain. But I do want to acknowledge all of that effort that has gone in. It seems like there was some really good communication and coordination between the GMT and the GAP on things. And acknowledging the extra work the Science Centers did for us. I was remiss yesterday in thanking Miss Steele for her work on the EFP when we were talking about that and others spoke to it. I'm supportive of moving the....doing what we need to do to keep that fishery going until the rule comes in place and allowing for it south of 42°, and I believe we're going to be speaking to that. And yeah, I think we're in a good place to move forward fairly expeditiously today. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:06] Thank you Lynn. Other discussion? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:15] Thank you Chair. I just want to spend a moment to tie back to the previous discussion that we just had about the assessment process in light of what we ultimately got to with the SSC recommendation for widow, and I think the table in the report gets to a situation that I want to highlight and think about National Standard 8 again. National Standard 8 does have language about choosing the alternative that has less impact to industry when we have 2 alternatives that have similar conservation risk. And when I look at the max risk that B falls below B 40 between alternatives 2b and 2d I don't see a lot of difference. And so this was a case where, you know, I know this was a really long process. I appreciate all of the work that went into reconsidering that assessment over and over again and thinking about it in more and different ways, but what we're trying to get to with all the risk assessment discussions and the thinking about this is this way that we can create flexibility in the process to look for opportunities to create opportunities for people when the conservation risks are not that great, and I think this is a really good, clear to see example where I don't see a lot of difference in the risk. So again, I really appreciate the work that was done, but I....yeah, still struggling with the outcome of this one. So that's all.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:51] Thank you. Caroline McKnight, I saw your hand.

Caroline McKnight [00:03:57] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, I just have some general comments similar to what Miss Mattes just commented on. While it took us maybe less than an hour to get through these materials, it really can't quite show how much work has gone in over the last year to get to this point. How many one-on-one conversations, delegation meetings, stakeholder meetings we've been holding. So while I would agree that we did not have the ability to include new management measures and spend a lot of time building rationale or talking through those kinds of new changes, a lot goes into even these management, what I might call routine management measures under this particular process. There is still a lot of information that changes and is dynamic and fluctuates. I'm channeling the information that we received I think under Open Comment about the environmental conditions that we're experiencing this year and possibly to next and how that might affect the decisions that we could or could not be making here today, but all of that is to say that I don't want to minimize the amount of consideration and work that our stakeholders have put into coming up with a simple statement that is, you know we still want to go with PPA. I don't want to minimize it. I also just want to take a minute to come back and reflect on the comments we just heard from Miss Steele about this EFP. I very much appreciated the conversation that took place yesterday under E.5 about how we can modify and sort of bifurcate this EFP in a way that keeps the right piece moving in the right direction for consideration and regulation. And the other piece to the south really continuing to be allowed so that it can thrive and hopefully meet that 3-year mark and be a good new source of fishery opportunity off California. And then I just again want to come back to restructuring. A lot of the items in front of us that we went through quickly are what I would say not changing or remaining as PPA, but there are a few things that do warrant I think just a little bit of extra conversation. Specific to our blackgill math, that's one that's changed a few times, I was very pleased to hear that there was some additional conversation about that and we're still at a status quo or an FPA that hasn't changed from PPA. With that, again just want to say thank you to Council staff and all the support for getting here and getting us to this decision point. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:40] Thank you. Other discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:06:46] Thank you. I'll just add a couple of comments here too. And thank you Miss McKnight for the comment about the work that goes into PPA. So it sounds really simple, but we met several times with our Washington recreational stakeholders to get to that idea for our management measures and really appreciate the engagement that we get, that's just one example of it. And all the thinking and the discussions that go on between the SSC, GMT, GAP really, I think, has set us up here this afternoon nicely for taking final action on spex. I also want to just flag that we're....the action here is removing a rebuilding plan for yelloweye rockfish. And when I started working on groundfish the common statement was, yelloweye wouldn't be rebuilt in our lifetime, and here we are and that's pretty exciting and it feels like we should be celebrating it more than we are. So also thank the Council and everyone for the conversations around canary rockfish allocation. This is another place where we settled on status quo, trawl, non-trawl allocations. I appreciate everybody engaging in the conversation and thinking about the information that we put forward in our WDFW Reports on this. I know, I think....well, I'll just say, I think what I've heard from the Council is an acknowledgement that we should be doing better at attaining our ACLs and really appreciate that, and that that will be moving forward and have the opportunity for further exploration under the risk management project. Yeah, I think that's it. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:00] Thank you. Any other discussion? All right, so I'm going to see if there's not any discussion, take this up again tomorrow or are we ready for motions today on this? If we're ready for motions I think I will first look to David Sones if there's a Tribal motion here.

David Sones [00:09:31] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, we do have a motion to get things started here. Okay, I move the Council adopt as a Final Preferred Alternative the Tribal set-aside, the harvest guidelines and allocations as shown in Agenda Item E.6.a, Supplemental Tribal Report 1, June 2026.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:00] Thank you. What's on the screen appears accurate and complete, is that right?

David Sones [00:10:04] Yes it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:05] Thank you. Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion.

David Sones [00:10:10] Just briefly. I really appreciate all the work that's gone into getting us where we ended up and being able to meet the obligations of our management measures. And appreciate my staff and the people who have gotten this in for us. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:30] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? Seeing none I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:10:43] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:45] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you David. All right, I'm not sure if there's any order here so I'll see whose hand goes up first. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:11:03] Thank you Mr. Chair. I believe we have a motion coming up. I move the Council adopt as final recommendations for 2027-2028 Exempted Fishing Permits as follows. Number 1: The West Coast Seafood Processors Association and Oregon Trawl Commission year-round Trawl Gear EFP, Agenda Item E.6, Supplemental Attachment 9 for the area north to 40° 10' North lat. until expected future implementation into regulations. And for the area south of 40° 10' North Lat. for the entire biennium. And Number 2: The California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fishery Dependent Biological Data Collection, Agenda Item E.6, Attachment 5.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:47] Thank you. All the language on the screen appears accurate and complete, is that right?

Caroline McKnight [00:11:53] It is.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:54] Is there a second of the motion? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Please speak to your motion.

Caroline McKnight [00:11:58] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just starting out, both of these EFPs have been supported and recommended by the GAP and GMT, so there's consensus there. I'm starting with the year-round trawl EFP, the Trawl Gear EFP. Again, this is a renewal of an existing EFP and there are no off-the-top deductions that are needed to accommodate it. This EFP was part of a lengthy Council discussion and action that was taken yesterday under Agenda Item E.5. The technical merits of this EFP and the data collection to date for the area north of 40°10' have demonstrated that this EFP is ready for consideration to be moved into regulation. Putting it here in this particular process is meant to ensure that the activity can continue until such time it is no longer needed as a result of being moved into regulation, so essentially a backstop. We don't want to stop the activity for any reason procedurally. For the area south of 40°10'. Again, there was considerable and lengthy discussion under E.5 describing the importance of the continuance of this data collection portion in the south to meet that 3-year minimum requirement. And it is specifically in this area to evaluate the salmon bycatch in closed areas. Moving on to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife EFP. Again, the department values the opportunity to utilize this EFP process to contribute to a larger aging data pool and data cap gaps. As considered under the other part of this action, some allowance of limited retention for cowcod and yelloweye is anticipated to be allowed, and so the minor changes that we made from last biennium are to account for that so that it's enforceable, the data stream collection doesn't stop. Again, this one also does not require any off-the-top deductions. It is accounted for in our standard recreational fishery harvest estimation process, and it really makes use of acquiring the fishery dependent information without having to carve out other allocative needs. With that I'll stop there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:06] Are there any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:14:16] Thank you. Thank you Caroline for the motion. I just want to note I think, you know, I'm appreciative of the work on both EFPs, but specifically on the Trawl Gear EFP, and sort of the new activity on the portion of the EFP south of 40°10'. Just generally say, you know, we're really hoping that since it sounds like we now have interest, right, that we have others beyond just the one boat that's participating now that are going to join this EFP and so I'm just sort of putting that out there. I've had some good conversations with Lori and others and I'm hopeful that there are some other boats that are going to be interested in joining this activity so that when we are looking at evaluating the data to consider moving that part into regulation we have a good dataset for us to look at. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:04] Thank you. Other discussion on the motion? Not seeing any I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:15:12] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:15] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Caroline. You have your hand up, something more?

Caroline McKnight [00:15:24] I do. Thank you Mr. Chair. Separate from the motions, I would like to offer some additional guidance specific to this EFP renewal for the Trawl Gear EFP midwater that is for the north of 40°10' portion. There is one active participant, as you just

mentioned Miss Kent, and the hope is that more will be joining. But as described, this EFP as described in the attachment, the EFP currently includes area-based Chinook salmon bycatch caps north and south of 42° North Lat. specifically to be kept to keep the impacts of the EFP within those analyzed under the 2017 biological opinion, an incidental take statement for continuing operations of fisheries managed under our groundfish FMP. Caps for the 2027 EFP are proposed to be consistent with the previous years at 1,000 Chinook salmon north of 42° Lat. and 100 Chinook salmon south of 42°. However, there are no caps in the EFP for coho salmon. So the request is for NMFS to consider whether a coho cap or caps is appropriate when reissuing the EFP considering the goal of the EFP is to examine salmon bycatch in areas that otherwise are off limits to midwater rockfish trawl activity, and considering that all coho stocks off California are listed. The impacts of the non-whiting fishery, which includes bottom-trawl, midwater non-whiting trawl, LE and OA fixed gear and recreational fisheries combined on coho salmon are analyzed under the biOp for both SONCC coho and Central California Coastal coho. So including a cap on coho is important to ensure fishing activity in this EFP south of 40°10' remains within the extent of impacts analyzed for these ESUs in the biOp and authorized per the ITS. Thank you for that additional comment.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:26] Thank you. Okay, other items? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:17:38] I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:44] All right, if that's it on the screen please go ahead.

Heather Hall [00:17:48] I move the Council adopt the recommendations of the GAP and GMT as FPA for groundfish specifications and management measures in 2027-2028 as described in Agenda Item E.6.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, June 2026, and Agenda Item E.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1, June 2026 for Items 1 through 3, and 5 through 21 from the Action Item Checklist, which is Agenda Item E.6, Supplemental Revised Attachment 1. And allow NMFS and Council staff the ability to make technical revisions to the package should they arise without having to bring them back to the Council.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:39] Thank you Heather. What I see on the screen appears accurate and complete?

Heather Hall [00:18:43] Yes it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:45] Is there a second to your motion? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Please speak to your motion.

Heather Hall [00:18:51] Thanks. Well, this....the idea of this motion is it covers the remaining items in the Action Item Checklist. I think we spoke a little bit about the idea that we've had really good discussions about what it, what it means to move primarily PPA to FPA throughout the 3-meeting process here, but particularly between April and June. I think this is a really rare spex cycle where we have that, so not any changes or red flags coming to the attention of the Council between April and now. That's it. And yeah, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:39] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:19:48] Thank you Chair. And thank you Miss Hall for working on this. This seems like a very simple motion that contains a lot of stuff within it. It almost feels like a letdown frankly...(laughter), but given as I mentioned earlier, given the the reduced scope of what we can do this year, the fact that the FPA is the PPA for almost everything, we, the state folks were really working to try to make this a simple process. And I appreciate the back-and-forth with my counterparts with our NMFS staff and our Council staff officers. Hopefully this works for everybody. Was trying to be efficient, especially given that we went so long yesterday we were trying to make up a little bit of time. So just want to acknowledge that while it may seem simple, there's a lot here. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:42] Thank you Lynn. Other discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:20:49] Thanks. I'll just start by thanking everyone. There was so much work from so many people that went into this so that just has to be acknowledged, and I'm incredibly grateful for how many amazing scientists and industry members and folks who make this all happen. In this motion I see is contained where we're moving on widow and I have some really strong discomfort with this. Looking at the documentation that the SSC has supplied, if we're going with Alt. 2d or SSC-1, which is what the GAP and GMT suggested, we're looking at an implied P Star of .4999. To me, what we are saying is that we are willing to flip a coin of whether we are going to engage in overfishing or not. I think this is a dangerous game to play with the species that we know is so important, and precisely because it is so important to our midwater trawl fleet, especially those who focus mostly on rockfish, and we've heard a lot about this in the last year. And so that importance to me is a reason to be thoughtful and careful about how we move forward on this. Both the default and SSC-1 will have consequences for the fleet. That 20% ramp-down was raised on the floor in April and I voted that forward because I wanted that idea to have space. And I really value folks around the Council process who have been coming forward with creative ideas about how we can manage better, how we provide more opportunity, and so I don't want this to be taken as a critique of these concepts that are coming forward. At this moment on this particular species I don't agree with the application of that concept. And again, that is because just how important widow is. And as we saw in the SSC documentation, the 20% ramp-down is a clear violation of National Standard 1 and National Standard 2, and that was as also described in the draft EA. Regarding the Alt. 2d, what we have on the floor right now, we're looking at 1 metric ton. And that, as a margin of error, is so small. It may be legal, and I will....this is a very clear acknowledgement that that is a legal option, but to me it doesn't make sense. I think this is so close to be planning for overfishing that I'm struggling to endorse this with a straight face. Sometimes when I'm really struggling with a Council decision I think of myself standing before a judge. How would I defend this? How would talk about this? In my head it's Judge Judy. But if I can't make an argument and still feel honest about it then I know something is wrong, and in this case that's how I feel. Thinking about this .4999 implied P Star to me feels like we are coming so close to what is legal. If we move forward with the stock assessment for widow in 2029 as is currently the plan, and I agree we should do that, and we hopefully do not, but if we do get something back that we don't like we'll just be that much further in the hole. This time we looked at the stock assessment three times to the point where this had basically become a benchmark if I understand it correctly,

and so the results are not easily disregarded and even beyond the sort of legal BSIA determination. I have confidence in the assessments. I very much look forward to 2029. It sounds like NMFS is thinking about some potential new methodologies that are going to be better, that will have better information, but I do have confidence in the current assessment. We have heard from industry members very clearly that they are seeing more fish in the water. I hear that and I appreciate their input, and I hope we have ability to have better communication, a way that that information can come in in 2029. But again, I have faith in the current assessment and I think it is very clearly good science and something we should and can base management on. Another thing I've really been struggling with, and this has come up earlier in this meeting, is sort of this, I want to say values, but it's kind of a values call about how we manage and what our industry wants. Do we manage to big up and downs? We noticed in the last agenda item we're not hearing we don't big up and downs, that we're hearing swings are not what we want, that we lose trust and we lose faith from our public when we have stock assessments that come back that are here or there and we're doing management that feels like it's not responsive enough. And so we're thinking and being told that we need more structure around our stock assessments and that we need management tools to avoid these big swings, that we to think about tools that implement things like pausing. When I hear that I think long term I want to focus on stability and I've heard that from multiple Council members, thinking about stability as a value that we are shooting towards in our management, which ultimately when it comes to actually managing means taking less risk and actually responding slower in both directions, up or down, and not taking more risk with faster responses. Partially why this is so hard for me is because I believe that that values choice is one that our fishermen should largely make. I believe the decision about how that risk is incorporated and how that risk is played out in our fisheries is best made by the people on the water, the best made....best made by the folks who are putting things at stake. So I'm looking forward to our risk management coming down the line, but I will say that I'm struggling because I'm hearing two things, going something so risky to .4999 and also that we don't want wild swings in our fisheries. I respect the recommendation from the GAP and the GMT as I always do and I just think that the Default is a better choice. All options describe by the SSC may be legal, but at the end I find Default overall just more defensible. Speaking to the motion, what I'm talking to is obviously just widow for the moment. It wasn't pulled out as a standalone motion. And I'm guessing how well this has been pulled together with communication from Council members and across the last year where the states are, at least are on this, so this has being packaged together. I plan to vote no, but I do want to be clear that I support what is implied on the page for all other species.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:14] Thank you. Other discussion? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:28:19] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you Corey for your comments on widow. I hear what you're saying and maybe I want to acknowledge that when I think about managing widow in this next biennium and looking at the alternative Harvest Control Rule that we are selecting with this motion. Thinking about what's happening in the widow fishery, you know there in April there was a really good discussion in the GAP about the widow allocation and there was discussion about how the 300 metric tons that is set up for the non-trawl sector is unlikely to be taken. And they had a hard discussion about whether or not they should move some of that fish from non-trawl to trawl in light of the new stock assessment results, and there was a really good discussion there and ultimately they decided to stay where they were at. So I think there's likely going to be fish that are uncaught in the non-trawl allocation that provides us with an additional

buffer up to the ACL. This is a trawl-dominant species and we have a really good management system for trawl. Boats do not have the ability to legally leave the dock when they are in deficit, right, when they don't have the quota pounds in their accounts for that fish. That's the control system that this Council set up in order to be able to manage that fishery very closely with individual accountability. I think it's a good system. I think you're raising good points, and I think that we have a strong management system that we have responsive information during the season about what's happening. So I do take that.....I take your comments to heart, but I also think that our system in this case is set up well to be able to allow us to have this flexibility.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:07] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:30:09] Thanks Keeley for that. I appreciate that. One aspect of how we do our groundfish management here that I thought was always really impressive and something I've learned more about the years I've spent at this Council has been the value of inseason management and what an important tool that is, how much flexibility, however you wanted to find that word, I'm using it now to say it provides us flexibility throughout a biennium cycle to be able to go up or down, and I think sometimes we forget how important and powerful that tool can be. I appreciate your thoughts on that and why you feel that provides a sort of measure of security as well as the 300 metric tons that are in non-trawl. I'm really happy that the GAP had that conversation. I also think that we are planning to go right up to the edge. And I go back to 1 metric ton being such a small amount of fish. And I too am very hoping that if we need to we will be able to adjust this inseason. If we're going to go over that we do not go over by much because we have this ability. I just worry when it comes to folks planning their seasons when it comes to what they decide to do with their quota, I would rather have it out on the table at the beginning, I think that's a better way to go, and I also just think that it's just too close to the edge. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:45] Thank you. Other discussion on the motion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:31:50] Thank you, and thank you for the comments. I want to speak to a couple things. I think this widow rockfish situation has provided the opportunities for some really good conversations and I haven't been one of the people in those deep into those conversations, but I do appreciate that the conversation around risk and balanced with impacts on industry is really important, and it's one that we've probably said this every day this week we're talking about in multiple different agenda items, and so I think in this situation where you look at the risk across the 3 different alternatives they're not drastically different, and this option, this FPA proposal here does try to strike that balance to recognize the need of industry. I also want to say too that I appreciate your point about widow being included in this big motion, and it was not intentional to try to bury it and so thanks for raising that. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:09] Thank you. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:33:11] Thank you so much for the motion and I just want to bring up comments from Miss Kalez earlier. The opportunity that we will get for California recreational fishermen with the season that we're putting forward here will affect everybody. California is really diverse, and I know we say that, but our world of fishermen, recreational fishermen, is everything from shore-based fishermen to float tubers to kayakers to very small aluminum skiff to center

consoles and up from there. And in the last several years of these really restrictive swings of RCA lines inside 50 fathoms, outside 50 fathoms, inside 20, outside 50, all of these different areas, it really excluded a lot of our private recreational small boat, kayak, nearshore fishermen, from being able to participate at all. And so, and it also really hampered people who rely on access to the islands, whether the Northern Channel Islands, the Southern Islands, wherever it be to prosecute multi-day fisheries. And a lot of trips were canceled because they wouldn't be able to deal with the weather situation on the far side of the line or switch between bluefin or white sea bass and rockfish or halibut and calico bass, this will provide that flexibility of really the issue was a transit issue. And so this will relieve that for California recreational fishermen and it will provide more opportunity. We still have restrictions with vermilion and copper and other things, but this will go a long way for a lot of people. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:08] Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:35:10] Thanks, I just want to comment on widow one more time because I think about it a lot because I'm doing inseason management for the CPs right now. And I've been looking out across our overall catch in the past 10 years, especially for these constraining species like canary and widow, but what I do know about this fishery overall is that we've rarely had ACL overages let alone OFL overages. And that, as the numbers have gone down, we've avoided rather than going right up to the numbers. And so I just want to be clear that the impact is going to be borne by industry, especially as the numbers go down, where their fishing will constrain rather than going right up to the number. I think that's going to be the result that we see. I'd be willing to bet on it. And I know, yeah Miss Kent said this is a trawl dominant fishery for widow. We have impeccable management. We are doing our hardest work to keep the numbers low, and I know that the same is true....yeah, what Keeley said about the IFQ sector as well is true. So I know that the margin is really slim in terms of the numbers that are laid out in Magnuson, but I'm also really confident in the work that this Council does and the work that our fishermen do to keep below the numbers that are set. So that's all.

Pete Hassemer [00:36:43] Thank you. Other discussion? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:36:46] Yeah, just to maybe add some clarity to this. I mean two of the comments that Corey made, I think we left 1.3 million pounds in the water every year the last four years so....

Pete Hassemer [00:37:02] So Brad, I just want to make sure the comments are focused on the motion and its impact on management.

Brad Pettinger [00:37:11] So what I'm saying is that I think that overfishing, I'm perfectly happy with the numbers that are in front of us. The issues that got us into overfished status in the early 2000s will never happen again under the regime we have right now, impossible. It'll only happen because of stock assessment reinterprets what the fishery's done over the last years, and it's not because of the actions this Council has done or the fleet.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:36] Thank you. Other discussion on the motion? Not seeing any I'm going to call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:37:47] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:47] Opposed?

Corey Ridings [00:37:50] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:37:52] Abstentions? The motion passes with one no vote, Corey Ridings. Thank you Heather for the motion. I'm not sure at this point if I need to look for hands or check with Todd on what else on that long checklist needs to be done here.

Todd Phillips [00:38:18] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to refresh my memory, the FMP language was included in that motion, yes?

Pete Hassemer [00:38:29] Let me look around to the people who made the motion. And Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:38:39] Yes, it's Action Item Number 21.

Todd Phillips [00:38:47] Through the Chair, thank you Miss Hall. It was up on the screen for a while and my brain just turned off so I appreciate it. So looking to your task list here, the Council has accomplished all of those tasks and you have adopted your harvest specifications for the next two years. You adopted the widow rockfish, OFL, ABC, ACL, your EFPs, your off-the-tops, et cetera, and your allocations. And congratulations, the Council now in the FMP will have no overfished rebuilding plans, so you've done some great work and I appreciate it. And with that I would say you've achieved your motion.....your action here.

Pete Hassemer [00:39:30] All right, thank you. Any closing comments? There have been references that this has been a years work. I think it's much longer than that if you go back to the stock assessments and the work that fed into all of this, so appreciate everybody's dedication and work on that. It appears we have completed this agenda item so we will close that.

7. Stock Assessment Terms of Reference for 2027-28

Butch Smith [00:00:00] We'll open it up for Council discussion. Miss Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:06] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Just a couple of quick comments in general. I want to thank the work of all the Council staff on this, the SSC, the GAP, the GMT. You know we've had several other agenda items this meeting where we've talked about these incremental improvements to our process and I think, you know, the TOR is definitely part of that. I've been really pleased to see some of the new thinking and some of the improvements we can make to our process and I appreciate that. There's some good new ideas and they'll take some work to think through and what they look like, and I'm glad we have another chance at this agenda item before it's wrapped up this cycle. But just want to express my appreciation for the work that's done....we have done thus far and all of the good thinking about ways to keep doing our work better. So wanted to express that.

Butch Smith [00:00:57] Thank you. Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:01:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Agreed Miss Kent, thank you. I appreciate the stepwise approach we're taking to evaluate where we need to go and make improvements. Based on the question I asked the GAP, it might be not a surprise that between our previous agenda item about process improvement and today it seems like maybe we've missed a piece that has not come up yet and was not included in the Lynker Report and is not anywhere in the reports before us today, which is how and when and where the best practices guide integrates with this flow of review of products? And it just occurs to me that a lot of the discussion that occurs when we get to a review process for an assessment falls back on fixed parameters versus other more technical pieces that have an impact on the output of the model and so we don't even reference it in the TOR at all, and maybe that's not the best place, but I'm just....this is coming to me today after more time about the prior agenda item and I don't know if it ties in here, if it tries in when we come back at some other point, but I don't want it to slip by and miss an opportunity to make sure that we're not providing crosswalks and connectivity between all of the resources that are guiding our stats to have discussions about assessments in general. Beyond that, I am very, very encouraged by the challenging discussions that everyone has been through to put forward a really good and comprehensive next step for improvement, and I just appreciate that. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:02:58] Brad, I think you were first, and then Jaime Diamond.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:02] All right.

Butch Smith [00:03:02] I saw you first anyway, so I'm sorry.

Brad Pettinger [00:03:05] Thank you Vice-Chair Smith. I really like the GAP-led appendix, the idea of that. I think that's a great idea. It's certainly a responsibility for them to put that together and keep up with it. But I still think, and that's going to help immensely, but I still think that some members of the stock assessment team should go out on a boat for a trip or two and just see how the fishery works. And I think that....I don't think to have a GAP-led appendix should be an excuse

not to do that. I'm not saying to go on a boats a requirement, but I think that really shows to me that they're really serious about learning all the details that go into the fishery and really add the color and the depth to an assessment. So anyway, but good stuff here, thank you.

Butch Smith [00:04:02] Thank you Brad. Jaime.

Jaime Diamond [00:04:04] Thank you Vice-Chair. Support what Brad just said and the importance of the GAP-led appendix but also making sure people get the fullest understanding of what is happening out on the water when they're....to have a better understanding of what they're looking at, the data on the paper or on their computer screen, what that means, how to contextualize it better. I think there are some stock assessors who in the last few years have really started to grasp that and understand that and are going above and beyond to understand that. I've seen it on some of them coming out on my boats and hearing about them coming out on other boats so I'm really encouraged. I also want to touch on what Miss McKnight said. I think we heard from the GAP statement, I highlighted it yesterday, they were hoping for an opportunity to at least discuss or put a flashlight on some of the opportunity to look at those more technical decisions, and so I would echo what Miss McKnight brought up of like where does that happen? When? And I know that, I think it's in March, I'm looking at the YAG, accepted practices? I don't know if that's it or somewhere else, but I think that It also goes into the desire that was brought up and comments that were made about kind of a last opportunity to even understand what those parameters are being between when the assessment is done but before the STAR Panel is kind of like until we do something else that seems like the only opportunity to look at that and know what those parameters are and what those choices were that were before it goes into the STAR Panel, and so if we can do that even before then and have a better understanding of what those are, I think that would be incredibly helpful. Because we've heard over the last several years through GAP statements and public testimony those choices have exponential consequences when we get to OFLs and ABCs, those different buffers, the different parameters fixed, whatever it may be, and so an opportunity to daylight those would be much appreciated. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:06:33] Thank you. Any other questions? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:39] Thank you Vice-Chair. I wasn't seeing any other hands going up. I do have a motion prepared if we are to that point.

Butch Smith [00:06:46] I think we are at that point. It would probably promote some more discussion so go ahead.

Lynn Mattes [00:06:55] Thank you Vice-Chair. The fine gentlemen in the back have the draft motion. And if they could make it just a little bigger. Thank you. I move the Council adopt the detailed outline of the Terms of Reference for groundfish stock assessment as shown in Attachment 1 for final adoption in November 2026 and work to include recommendations from the GAP in their Supplemental Report 1, the GMT Supplement Report 1, and SSC Supplementary Report 1. Have one page-at-a-glance summaries for stock assessments be part of the process but not part of the TOR, the T-O-R. Criteria for changes in stock assessment type, on-ramps and off-ramps. Keep the Executive Summary content robust, consistent with previous assessments. GAP-led appendix as a living document with first iteration in November, December timeframe of even

years prior to the pre-assessment workshops and probable last iteration for inclusion in STAR Panel Report. Incorporating risk tables as a Terms of Reference to our component. And alternative catch streams for potential use in management.

Butch Smith [00:08:15] Does your motion clearly reflect what you said on the screen?

Lynn Mattes [00:08:19] Yes sir, I believe it does.

Butch Smith [00:08:21] All right, can I get a second to the motion? I got Brad Pettinger second the motion. Speak to your motion?

Lynn Mattes [00:08:28] Thank you Vice-Chair. This is a starting point for our final discussion in November. The GAP, the GMT, and the SSC were all basically in alignment on their recommendations and I did try to include them there. At the risk of tooting our own horn, Ali Whitman with our ODFW's North Pacific SSC member, created one-pagers for us at ODFW to help with our Commission and they went over really, really well, both with our, the ODFW Commissioners as well as our public, so I'm glad to see that the Science Centers have incorporated those. It helps us tell our story, and that's very important as we work with our public. The on-ramps and off-ramps have been a repeated discussion earlier this week and previously, so having some criteria on that. I was involved in 2 STAR Panels where they should have been contemplated, being the yellowtail assessment in 2017 south we got partway through the week and just the data wasn't there. The model wasn't working. This was a no-go. Alternately in 2015, the black rockfish Oregon assessment, which I still have nightmares over, we powered through and we had a working approved model at 4:45 on Friday afternoon of the STAR Panel. So having some criteria about when and where to onboard, off-ramp, et cetera, is important. Executive Summaries are also important as, you know oftentimes our assessments we get three or four assessment documents at the same time. And even if it's our full-time job it can be a struggle to get through all of those documents so the Executive Summaries is extremely helpful. Do appreciate the GAP's willingness to take some of the onus on themselves about providing the index, or appendix, apologies. I really appreciate their willingness to be part of the process, but that will be some additional workload for GAP members and I appreciate that they're willing to do that. And then risk tables, whatever we're calling them, I think are an important component as well, as long as we're very clear that they are not an additional buffer. It's to help us gauge how risk-averse we want or risk.....how risky we want to be. It's work that's been going on through our EWG and our EAS for a while and really appreciate that. And I do agree on the alternate catch streams for use in potential management. The sooner we can identify those, the better. So just appreciate trying to improve this process as we move forward and having the guidelines so that everybody knows the playbook, everybody knows what we're.....what's expected and how we're going to move forward with our assessments going forward. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:11:32] Thank you Lynn. Any clarifying questions to the motion maker? Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:11:40] Thank you very much Mr. Vice-Chair. And thank you Miss Mattes for the proposal. Can we just scroll to the last bullet? And this is something I should have asked when the GAP gave their input, but is the reference to alternative catch streams the same as alternative catch projections? Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:05] Through the Vice-Chair, Dr. Lent, yes, I think it's just slightly different terminology for the same thing. It's using what the expected catch each year is to project for the next few years out. And if it's full attainment versus maybe 50% attainment, as you go year to year it changes that 10-year approach. So having those earlier may save us some time with doing a catch-only update in future iterations. Thank you for the clarifying question.

Butch Smith [00:12:33] Any other clarifying questions? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:12:36] Thank you. I was just going back to the guidance we provided, that was provided under E.3, and specifically to add an additional GAP or GAP recommended representative to the STAR Panel process, and this would be an amendment to the TOR, is that included in this? Or do we need to include it here? Sorry, and maybe...yeah, stopping.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:07] Through the Vice-Chair, Miss Hall, I don't think it's explicitly included here. If it was explicitly included in the GAP Report, the intent was anything that I missed in this list that is in the GAP and GMT and SSC Reports, but if it's not explicit we may want to add it so that it's perfectly clear. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:13:32] Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:13:32] Thank you. I think there were things yesterday from E.3, and I think that's part of what Miss Hall was getting at, that would be....that the intent of that was for it to get incorporated into the TOR. And I don't know if it needs to be added here as well because it was pointed out in the motion for E.3 and some of them explicitly said to be added into the TOR. So procedurally I don't know if that, if calling the E.3 guidance into this is appropriate, or if having that on its own still makes it in the end to the TOR?

Butch Smith [00:14:12] Merrick.

Merrick Burden [00:14:13] Yeah, thank you. It is a little bit confusing because of the overlap in the themes here. But I guess from my vantage point, the guidance yesterday did affect the TOR in some ways and so we'll just do that, what you're talking about. And then unless the motion maker intends for this to replace that guidance, which I don't think you're saying, we can move ahead without having to do an amendment to the motion.

Jaime Diamond [00:14:43] Fabulous. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:14:47] Okay, so I think we've got that cleared up. And so now I'll open it up to discussion. Anybody? Discussion on the motion? Seeing none.....Oh, Merrick? Heather?

Heather Hall [00:15:07] Well, thank you. I was just going to offer appreciation for this motion. And I also wanted to say for the related conversation we had under E.3, there was really good guidance in there and I'm glad we are talking about it in support of this this motion as well.

Butch Smith [00:15:26] Okay Merrick. I think you have it.

Merrick Burden [00:15:26] Yeah, thank you. And just a clarifying comment. On the topic of risk tables there's been some mention that they are not an additional buffer. Our risk table item, as we've talked about this internally and with the region, there is a good likelihood that it would take an FMP amendment, and that is because of the policy side to the risk table. So I don't think that means that the motion is affected here, but it's just in terms of how do we use the risk tables. Essentially, what is the P-Star that goes along with the risk tables? We haven't decided that yet. And so I think it is fully appropriate to continue down this road and have the assessment authors include those as part of the assessment. But as part our risk management discussion that's coming up later this year this will be a topic which is, what do we want to do on the policy side with these risk tables? So that's just a clarifying comment.

Butch Smith [00:16:30] Thank you Merrick. Any other discussion? All right, I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor accept by saying "Aye".

Council [00:16:41] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:16:42] Those opposed? Any abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you. So Diana, have we done what we set out to do here?

Diana Perry [00:16:57] Yes you have Vice-Chair. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:16:59] Okay, thank you. So now we will be going into.....oh Jaime, I'm sorry.

Jaime Diamond [00:17:08] That's okay. I just have a follow-up question to something Miss McKnight and I had asked about the best practices. Sorry, am I saying the right thing? Accepted practices, best practices, where that intersection is and just kind of somebody give us a little guidance on where that opportunity lies or maybe that's what you were going to get to and I apologize. Okay.

Butch Smith [00:17:37] Diana.

Diana Perry [00:17:37] So the accepted practices is referenced in the TOR. It is not necessarily mentioned in the outline itself, but it is mentioned throughout the TOR and we do not necessarily intend to take out of the TOR, and so that should be like part of the process and it is considered during the stock assessment process as well.

Jaime Diamond [00:18:05] Okay, thank you.

Butch Smith [00:18:07] Are we all right over there? Diana.

Diana Perry [00:18:16] Sorry, one additional thing. We will be bringing it back in, I believe it's March of 27', to have that conversation about the accepted practices guidelines as well. Does that better answer your question?

Jaime Diamond [00:18:27] Yes. Thank you.

Diana Perry [00:18:28] Okay. Sorry about that.

Jaime Diamond [00:18:28] So like we're not missing the opportunity in this moment I think is more so what we were concerned about. Okay, thanks.

Butch Smith [00:18:37] All righty, so have we completed our work on this topic? All right, so we'll take a 15-minute break so you can check out of your rooms.

F. Habitat Issues

1. Habitat Issues

Butch Smith [00:00:00] Okay, now it brings us to some Council discussion, considering the Habitat Committee's Report and recommendations. Maybe open the floor to that. Are we all satisfied? Oh, Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:19] Thank you Vice-Chair. Appreciate the work that the Habitat Committee has done to lay out these issues out for us, continue to track them. I'm normally not the one who sits for this for ODFW, so I'm doing my best to pinch hit today. Trying to think about are there places that we as a Council should comment? I do think, me personally, I think we should comment on the OOI System, but I think it's a done deal. I think that horse has already left the barn. The barn's been burnt down and planted over with grape seeds or something. I don't know what good it would do other than just putting it on the record that we were opposed to it. So is that a place we should spend our limited resources? I want to have strong thoughts on that and I think all of us around this table do, but is it worth our time? To what the Habitat Committee spoke about with their conversation with Bureau of Reclamation, BOR, hopefully we can have some continued, there can be some continued dialogue between Council leadership and their leadership on what the Habitat Committee and the rest of the Council is looking for. I appreciate that BOR has engaged and started the discussions with the Habitat Committee, but it sounds like they wanted some more, more details, so maybe there needs to be some refinement on that communication, so hopefully we can help, we, the Council leadership can help spearhead that along. So those were just a couple of thoughts that I had on this item. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:02:04] Thanks Lynn. Sharon?

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:08] I certainly share Lynn's disappointment and I'm wondering if maybe if we do decide to comment on it that we reframe it. I completely agree with you, the horse is way the hell outside of the barn. So saying we oppose it I don't know is productive, but certainly using the Habitat Committee letter as kind of a basis of articulating what we're losing and how important it is for our work, and then challenging the National Science Foundation or the administration about. And what are the ideas to replace and continue to support these needs? Do they have some magic bullet they haven't told us about with this dismantling? I suspect not, but to me that's a more productive conversation than just saying, you know, we oppose it. Because I agree with you, I think it's a done deal. Other than the cost of the program, that's the only element I've seen articulated in terms of why to dismantle it, which seems to me, given everything else that's going on with budgets very....not the reason you would do it. So anyways, that would just be something I would suggest we think about if we are going to comment.

Butch Smith [00:03:29] Thank you Sharon. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:03:34] Yeah, thanks Miss Mattes and Miss Kiefer, that's helpful. And then Miss Kiefer thinking about that I think you framed it really well just now. Just thinking about what we're losing. How is it going to be replaced? How might it impact our fisheries and our ability to

manage better? We heard a little bit earlier, I can't remember who said it, someone who was at the table about gliders, maybe it was under the public comment section where NMFS was giving their update and that they haven't decided yet about the gliders or we haven't heard yet about the gliders. So maybe the train is, to continue this analogy that Lynn started, I'm not sure I totally understand, but the train is out of the station, it's burning, It's moving, but maybe the caboose is still in the station. You know, maybe we could spare the caboose or something. So just saying I think I'm agreeing with this. I think It is important to articulate this. I think it is valuable for the record. I think I just heard Dr. Heppell say there is no direct comment period or anything like that, but maybe a letter to the National Science Foundation serves the purpose.

Butch Smith [00:04:52] I was ready for you John. Go ahead.

John Ugoretz [00:04:53] Thank you. And I guess, hello, nice to be here. I think just teeing off what was just said, I Certainly can see us writing a letter and leaning on the Habitat Committee to develop that letter. I think if we send something, given the fact that this is not a public comment period on an action that we have any control over, I would want that letter to very specifically include examples of data that we use that we will no longer have. And if we can't point to that I don't know that our letter has much import.

Butch Smith [00:05:36] Thank you. Any other comments? Real close. Heather.

Heather Hall [00:05:47] Thanks. I just want to speak in support of the idea that we're talking about. And I like the idea of being very specific and clear about what we lose, what fishermen lose, the impacts of this. And it doesn't feel right to just to not put a comment, to not say something, to not respond to what's happening and so I'm supportive on that. I was also just going to have a brief comment on the sanctuary, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Review, and just to let folks know WDFW has a seat on the Sanctuary Advisory Council. We've contributed to that updates in that way. We also, with the 4 Coastal Treaty Tribes, have a Intergovernmental Policy Council that is able to directly meet and interact with the National Marine Sanctuary Program and provide policy input through that forum as well, and we're in the process of setting up a meeting to do just that. So just wanted folks to know that we're engaged in a couple of different ways on that process. Thanks.

Butch Smith [00:07:11] Thank you Heather. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:07:13] Thanks Vice-Chair. I just wanted to quickly say I agree with John. I feel like we just are like shouting into the wind with a lot of this stuff unless we can really articulate why it's important. I think we all know, but like they obviously don't know. And I agree with Sharon's comment as well, that like the ask of what do you have in mind instead might be a helpful ask. And then it just occurred to me that a letter or some kind of correspondence like this might have more weight if it comes from like all of the Councils, like the CCC has sent letters that are pulling together a lot of different groups. I know that that just like changes the scope of this activity, but I'm curious if like there's any room for that, the Council's getting together and being like, this is terrible, can you talk to us about how to make things better? So that's all. Yes, can we engage other Councils? Is that possible?

Merrick Burden [00:08:28] Yeah, thanks Miss Szumylo, I appreciate that question. And I'm happy to reach out to the other Councils on this. We are in fairly regular contact about a variety of things. There's no guarantee they would agree to write something like this. I think just given the political nature of things right now, some Councils have different opinions about what to weigh in on and when than we do, so and vice-versa. So that's my answer. I'm happy to try if that's the will of the Council but I can't guarantee that the whole CCC would get behind something like that.

Butch Smith [00:09:01] Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:09:11] Thanks Vice-Chair Smith. I think John puts out a good point there. I think, but with that, I think it'd be good if we identify the information that we've been getting and we would like to continue to receive, maybe make it a question about what are their plans to replace that information stream, if any, and kind of elicit a response in that way. I mean, we're losing the weather buoy, right? I think that's kind of an important aspect for fishermen and mariners. I mean do they have something else? Is there something else in store to do this, to supply the information that we've been getting? I'm just trying to see if we'll write a letter do we want to do just more than just complain about that? Do we want to maybe make a request about what are they going to do to replace.....you know is there something in the pipeline to give us the information that we've been getting? Is there something different? Maybe it's not a good idea, but I'm just trying to think of a different way to approach this.

Merrick Burden [00:10:36] Well, thank you Mr. Pettinger. You're looking at me, so I assume you want me to respond to what you're saying...

Brad Pettinger [00:10:39] No, no, no. No, just threw it out there. No, not at all.

Merrick Burden [00:10:43] I guess as I'm just listening to the conversation I could see merit in taking a few steps. One would be to take an inventory of how are we and have we even used the data that is being lost and if we can go through and identify the various places where we've used that data, then the question is where are we going to turn now and maybe it's satellites or something. I don't know, I'm just throwing that out there. And maybe there is an answer. But there's like a sequence of steps that I can see us working with the Habitat Committee on, if you wanted to send a letter in that way. But I think to John's point that you're calling out, we'd first want to take inventory and say, how will we use that data?

Butch Smith [00:11:34] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:11:36] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'm hearing from the ODFW representative on the Habitat Committee that there's the expertise there on the Habitat Committee to go the direction that this discussion is. Also we have access to a lot of really good oceanography folks at OSU and I think U-dub that maybe we could pull on for technical assistance. I do like the idea of these are the things we're losing and what's the plan going forward rather than just complain. So the discussion has kind of circled me around. But yeah, be very intentional about what we write, but lean on our expertise on the Habitat Committee, that's why we've got those folks. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:12:29] Corey I thought I saw you. Corey go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:12:32] Thanks. I'm shifting gears here a little bit. Just looking at the Bureau of Reclamation California Water Operations, it's really unfortunate to hear that the Action 5 and the Initiative 6 plans are opaque and that they have not been consulting with California or are going to inform the public of their actions. So I would just endorse what the Habitat Committee recommended here in terms of trying to have more conversations with BOR leadership, get more information and explain their plans for water management and ultimately trying to understand how these operational changes are going to affect salmon. So just endorsing that and hoping that we can follow-up on that.

Butch Smith [00:13:21] Thank you Corey. All right. I think we have some clear direction. Did you want to say something Executive Director?

Merrick Burden [00:13:36] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chairman. I think it is helpful just to refer back to the Habitat Committee Report. They do have a summary of recommendations for Council consideration. You certainly don't have to pick up on all of those, but that is a helpful guide if you're asking what might you want to do. So there's the FERC Natural Gas Permit Reforms, the Bureau of Rec Water Management, as Miss Ridings just pointed to, Special Projects 1 and 3. We also just talked through the OOI Initiative. There's also a mention of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. So a few things hanging out there. I feel like we do have direction on the OOI. I'm not entirely sure where we're landing with Bureau of Rec and the others. I'm not really sure where we're at, but maybe Miss Bernaus has some more clarity?

Katrina Bernaus [00:14:25] Thank you. It seems like we do have some clarity on the Bureau of Reclamation recommendation. It sounds like the Council is endorsing the Habitat Committee's recommendations, but if you'd like to discuss that further, of course you can do so. I do think the Council has not touched on yet the Natural Gas Permit Reforms or the Special Projects if you'd like to discuss those, which were specifically called out in the Habitat Committee Report.

Butch Smith [00:15:04] John.

John Ugoretz [00:15:05] Thanks. And it's somewhat similar to my last comment, but with regard to the Natural Gas Permit Reforms for natural gas pipelines, I get what the Habitat Committee is sort of hinting at, with some of these areas are large and conceivably could impact wetlands and estuarine habitat. I think the scope of the particular change that's being proposed is maybe a bit beyond what we can really say is directly impacting Council management. And so similar to my last comment, I feel like sometimes we want to talk about everything that could ever possibly harm a salmon and maybe, you know, cow ranching in Iowa is not what we want get to. So I'd recommend skipping that one. We've got bigger fish to fry.

Butch Smith [00:16:05] Thank you John. And it's good to talk about everything that affects salmon, but anyway. So I think we're at a point Katrina where you've probably heard a lot of direction to form however the magic works in the system statement to look at so.....oh, I missed you Corey, I'm sorry.

Corey Ridings [00:16:33] I was late on the draw. I think there was one more, the Habitat Committee was asking about Special Projects 1 and 3. And so they had just been asking for next

steps regarding the Dynamic Ocean Modeling Workshop and I would say I would leave that to sort of Council staff as they're thinking about that and to just make sure the Habitat Committee is included where it makes sense and where possible and just recognize that I think they have a lot to add on that.

Butch Smith [00:17:04] Good suggestion. So I'll look around here. I feel like an auctioneer sometimes. All right, have we completed giving you enough information to go by?

Katrina Bernaus [00:17:18] Thank you. I think you've given enough information that we can bring back to Mr. Griffin on Council staff to work with the Habitat Committee to bring forth these recommendations. So thanks for the discussion.

Butch Smith [00:17:32] Okay, well thank you for everyone's hard work on this topic and the hard work today. I'm turning back the gavel to the Chairman.

G. Highly Migratory Species Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] There's no public comment signed up here, so that takes us into our Council task, discussion, and comment as appropriate. Any discussion to be had here? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:00:13] Good morning Mr. Chair. Thank you. Thanks Ryan for the report and for all the efforts in the HMS arena by NMFS. I just wanted to point out something that Ryan said, and it's regarding the loggerhead closure. And we as a Council are often asked how can we implement fisheries regulations that are responsive to the environment? And people act or say that, you know, we're never making regulations that have environmental triggers. And I just wanted to highlight that this is a long-standing regulation that goes into effect when the NOAA Climate Center predicts an El Nino event and a fishery is closed from fishing in a large area of the ocean to protect a sensitive species. It is the exact type of responsive regulation that people have asked for, and so I just, you know I don't think we get credit for that very often. I don't think NMFS gets credit for it and I just wanted to point it out. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:25] Thank you John. Other discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:01:31] Thanks. And thanks John, that's a really good point, and it's an example I think about as well. The information that goes into that I know is brought in from, I believe it's Dr. Elliot Hazen's work, and I'm forgetting the name right now, but the tool that he's developed to do that. And I don't know, Ryan, if you happen to know, but we heard earlier in the meeting about the dismantling of some of the ocean observing capabilities and the buoys, and I'm leaning to John's point about how this has been a really good example of how we've been able to use environmental data. It's an if-then we already have in practice, if that is going to be affected by the dismantling of the observation systems?

Ryan Wulff [00:02:22] Yeah, through the Chair, thank you Miss Ridings for the question. I heard that as well. I think it's too early to note right now if we're going to see that I mean.....but I appreciate the comments, right? And I appreciate also the comments by Mr. Ugoretz. It is something that we've had not only as a result of that data, but also it's been very effective, but also we've heard from fishermen, right? They're on the water sightings too have so increased sightings of these species during these types of conditions as well. So yeah.....so I think we'll know a little bit more as this plays out but it won't help, that's for sure.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:04] Thank you. Other discussion? Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:03:12] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. You know, I just want to recognize really the creativity and ingenuity that we have seen in our EFPs. When I started in this process it was deep-set buoy gear and we had 70-some, 60-some EFPs that were very, very similar. And we have seemingly moved away from that. I can remember going out there saying we should have drones with nets dropping on swordfish and people all snickered. But we now have people that are

out there trying flaming rings and helium balloons and just some really creative and fun stuff, and I think it's worth pausing just for a moment to recognize the inventiveness, but also the willingness to go out there and play and try and create in an environment that is difficult on the water, but also difficult in terms of regulation and management. So just worth mentioning this morning briefly.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:28] Thank you. And on that encouraging note too, I guess I was a little encouraged to hear in Mr. Wulff's report about opportunities to look at electric monitoring, or EM, for some of the observer coverage there. And I guess in my mind right now it's sort of a proactive seeing the ability to do that and test it simultaneously. I think here it's an important...you know, and under the EFPs and who knows what future conditions, when you require 100% observer coverage then the lack of ability to find that coverage shouldn't constrain the fishery, and so it expands the toolbox of methods available. So I encourage NMFS to pursue that and see what opportunities there are. And as I said, I kind of get the sense it's a little proactive seeing how it could be used and the opportunity to develop itself, so thank you. Other discussion? I'm not seeing any, so Gilly, does that complete our work?

Gilly Lyons [00:05:42] Thank you Mr. Chair. I believe it does. You've received a report from NMFS and had some good Council discussion and provided some comments and a couple of questions to NMFS. And I believe with that your work here is done.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:57] All right, thank you very much.

2. International Management

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] Okay, we've completed all of our reports, public comments, and additional supplemental report has been published on albacore. I'll look to any hands to initiate discussion. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:00:16] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I'm going to just jump out there and say I didn't put a motion out because this is recommendations, so more of guidance. I would provide the guidance that we adopt the recommendations from our HMS in both reports, the original one and the supplemental. Certainly don't want to stop discussion on that, but just figured I would start off with I don't have a motion. If we need one let me know and I'll wing something together and send it while we're all discussing. But I also wanted to take a minute and talk a little bit about the reason why I think artisan for fisheries is really important. And I appreciate you Corey for raising the question a couple of times. I think that there are a couple pieces to it. Firstly, the U.S. Delegation is large, at least at WCPFC, many of the members have....maybe get two delegates, some of them only have one, and it is a function of resources for people who can attend. So at times it feels a little bit like we're the giant entity in the room and our fleet, at least for albacore fishing, being a pole-and-line fleet is significantly smaller and we do really need to continue to raise that issue across the floor in that venue, but also just in general in terms of understanding about what we're dealing with. There's also the second component just in terms of the size of the fleet. You know I know when I'm thinking about what an artisan fishery is, in my head sometimes it's like hey, it's pangas or dory fishermen off the coast of Oregon out there, you know, in their rowboat or their small vessel. But in comparison to other fisheries in the Western Pacific, our fleet is artisan. When you look at purse seiners, we've got purse seiners that are over 1,500 tons. You know some of them are over 1,600 tons. These are very, very large boats. We have pole-and-line vessels that are out there at the 400 ton mark, and our own fleet isn't even a third of that in terms of our biggest boats. We have a lot of boats in our fisheries in the North Pacific in particular just because we have so many more fishermen that are in maybe the 30 ton range or 50 ton. So in terms of scale, you know a 30 ton boat is functionally the equivalent of a dory fisherman compared to somebody that's bringing in 1,600 tons. And I do think that it is appropriate, particularly in light of hearing testimony like Mr. Brown's, where he's traveling 5,000 miles from Bellingham with his wife and limited crew, that we do recognize the effort and the craftsmanship that these men and women are doing in terms of providing albacore and other species, but particularly albacore as an effort that is artisan. So with that, I will pause and let others talk, but hopefully that's helpful in terms of why you're hearing recommendations from the AS and people such as myself on the need for really highlighting and identifying what our fleet is doing.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:05] All right, thank you Christa. On your point about the guidance, I appreciate what you said. We would prefer a motion on that because it is the Council's recommendations to the U.S. Delegation. So at some point when we're ready we'll get to that, but more discussion? Dani Evenson.

Dani Evenson [00:04:22] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. In reference to HMSAS Report 1, specifically their recommendation relative to the Northern Committee proposal that they received

from Japan about conservation and management measures for North Pacific albacore to implement the harvest strategy. The HMSAS was recommending that the Council encourage the U.S. Delegation to work with Japan on this, and they were appreciative that it included the language of all fisheries in the EEZ and high seas north of the equator. I confirmed with Mr. Wulff offline that that only applies to their convention area. They do not have jurisdiction outside of their convention area. And my recommendation would be that the U.S. work, delegation workshop that language a little bit to clarify that it only applies to the convention area. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:38] Thank you. Further discussion on the matter? I'm not seeing any hands. Christa, I think you're ready with a motion? (Christa off-mic).....Nope, just you can watch as they type and make sure they capture it and not go too fast.

Christa Svensson [00:06:09] All right, so my motion will be, I move the Council adopt the recommendations from G.2 point....G, I guess it's G point 2 point a, Supplemental HMSAS Report 1. And G point 2 point a. Is it 'b'? I thought it said 'a' on there, but if it says 'b', it...nope. It's 'a'. Supplemental HMSAS Report 2. And....one moment here. And submit those positions to the U.S. Delegation, excuse me, delegations, for their upcoming international negotiations. And that is accurate and correct.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:51] All right. What's on the screen is accurate and complete. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Please speak to your motion.

Christa Svensson [00:08:00] Yeah, I think we had quite a number of recommendations from our HMSAS that would be beneficial. That is inclusive of the March recommendations that were included within that statement, just so that we're very clear about that. And I think that it has been proven to be extremely helpful in terms of the international delegations to know what the positions are from our fleets and from our managers here on the West Coast and through the Council process. I know on a number of occasions they have referenced those decision points in meetings, so having a clear record for them that they can look at and say hey, this is supportive of needs on the West Coast is helpful. So I will pause there and say thank you for giving me the opportunity to express those sentiments.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:01] Thank you. Are there any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:09:11] Thanks Mr. Chair. I'm supportive of the intent of the motion. I just want to clarify, and I don't know if it's a question for Christa or for NMFS, are we submitting positions to the U.S. Delegation or are we providing those recommendations to NMFS to submit to the delegation? I just want to make sure that what we're supposed to do.

Christa Svensson [00:09:42] Thank you. I'll take a stab at what I believe we have been doing, which is providing those recommendations. They're coming from the Council, but providing those recommendations, and those go in as part of a packet generally speaking, to the pack and to commissioners.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:07] Ryan Wulff, something to add?

Ryan Wulff [00:10:10] Yeah, on that point, thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, I think Christa is correct. And just as a process perspective, once the Council has their recommendation, NMFS also ensures that they are transmitted to the relevant delegation, right? Contained in all of these recommendations here in this motion is recommendations to the U.S. Delegation to the Joint Working Group of blue...Pacific blue fin, the Northern Committee of WCPFC, and also IATTC and WCPFC. So that's four separate delegations coming in one motion. So we, of course, understand that. We can parse that out and we can pass it on as appropriate.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:48] All right, thank you. John.

John Ugoretz [00:10:50] Yeah, sorry, a different thing. After Miss Svensson read her motion and said it was correct, there was an 'and' that got removed between the two reports. I believe what she said was that we're adopting the recommendations from Report 1 and Report 2, and we are submitting those to the U.S. Delegations.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:19] Thank you. I did not see that disappear. That's the language you said was accurate and complete?

Christa Svensson [00:11:24] That is the language that was accurate and complete. And thank you, I didn't catch that something magically disappeared.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:33] Great, thank you. Any other questions or discussion on the motion? Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:11:42] Yeah, thank you very much and appreciate the motion as obviously NMFS has a large role these delegations. I'll be abstaining in general because this is just for the Council to make these recommendations. But I did want to note now that I have seen the AS Report Number 2 which came a little bit late, but I appreciate the break to get a chance to digest that. I do want to flag that the second bullet of those recommendations specifically ask the U.S. Delegation to pursue recognition of one of our fleets as an artisanal fishery, and that is something we have not declared, I believe any of our fleets, artisanally at any major international organization. So that is a major change kind of in U.S. position that is being recommended here. So I just wanted to note that. There has also been, there's no....we're still checking at least in the IATTC, I'm not aware there is even a definition that has been defined. It has been an area that has created many discussions over many fisheries in not just the IATTC but various fora of what is defined as artisanal and how that component fits in with other specific aspects of measures, so I just wanted to flag that, that I think it's fine for the Council to recommend that, but just note that that term is caught up in quite significant other discussions at various fora, but the U.S. Delegation will of course take that into account when it looks at these. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:12] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:13:17] Thanks for this. Thanks for the motion Christa. Thanks Mr. Wulff for bringing that up. I'm aware of sort of what you're talking about in terms of the definition of artisanal. Does this actually fit this? How is that defined by different management forums including our own? As far as I know, this Council does not have a definition of artisanal. I would maybe turn

to Council staff to correct me on that if they know. May not, okay, we may not have an answer to that right now, but I just wanted to sort of endorse your thoughts on that Mr. Wulff and see, and I don't think that's like a direct thing we need to do. That's not something that needs to happen now, but just note sort of the current vagaries that exist around that definition and provide NMFS and the delegation flexibility in terms of how they're approaching that and they're used to best they can benefit our fleet.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:13] Thank you. Corey Niles had his hand up, but if this is on the same thread then I think Christa you were raising your hand first, then Brad Pettinger. Okay, then Corey Niles you were first.

Corey Niles [00:14:28] But I think maybe Christa was going to say, but I was...may say something similar to Corey, I believe, if NMFS has heard the intent that you expressed, that Clayton expressed, the reasons for that, so I would interpret the motion that give NMFS more flexibility to try to bring out that intent in the best way they could in these forums without... not necessarily that being the only way of going. And it's recognized kind of the long history of that fleet, the smaller catching power, and your intent would be to give NMFS, the delegation to try to get those things recognized in various methods rather than just going after a definition that might be novel and difficult.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:22] And Christa, I think it's back to you.

Christa Svensson [00:15:24] Yeah, so this is bordering on question for maker of the motion. Yeah, the intention of this is to support the recommendations from our stakeholders that we have heard. It is not to say that we are in any way, shape, or form forcing the hand of NMFS. They can take those into recommendation. Similar, the delegations can take them into the delegation and make a decision, so it is not about trying to change definitions, et cetera. It really is about reflecting the special nature of what it is that our fleets are doing. And in listening to this conversation, maybe starting the conversation in general about how do we want to define that? Do we want start down that path? That's not a question for today by any way, shape, or form. But no, the intention was not to tie NMFSs or anybody else's hands on the recognition of artisan, but just to put that forward as something that members of both the North Pacific and South Pacific fleet have raised over the course of years. And I will also say, having spent 20 years in marketing North Pacific albacore in particular, that artisan is something that that fleet has used in terms of sales marketing, et cetera. So certainly not part of the Council process, but I do think definitely is in the mental mapping of the stakeholders that are out there fishing for that product.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:10] Thank you. Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:17:13] Yeah, I just don't want to steal Clayton's thunder, but it does have a nice cachet to it, but it's my understanding that most of our fleet, of all the fleets we manage, most of them are artisanal so.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:30] Okay. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:17:33] Yeah, thanks, I appreciate that. That's additional color that I think is really helpful when we transmit it. My only intent in raising this was just to signify in the international realm sometimes terminology, you know, is very specific and has connotations that maybe are not what you're talking about here, so I just wanted to highlight that here. And I think you've explained that and the rationale is good. And we can pass that on along with the language that is in the recommendations per the motion. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:00] Thank you. Further discussion? Not seeing any I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:18:08] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:11] Opposed? Abstentions?

Ryan Wulff [00:18:14] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:15] Thank you. The motion passes. One abstention. Mr. Wulff. Thank you Christa. Further discussion? Now we have the set of recommendations. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:18:33] Yes, maybe a question for Ryan on the North Pacific albacore and our recommendation just passed about reflect the advice of subpanels and others view that more time is needed to understand some of these aspects of the Harvest Control Rule. I know you all, you pointed out at the beginning how busy this summer is for you all, but I'm just wondering if you might....again did, I did, and Phil Dion here and a number of us participated in one of those workshops, the last workshop, and there was some really detailed information which made available in a shiny app online that even gets down to like SPR equivalents per metric ton, which is things we never even talked about in groundfish even, but so just wondering if you could all think about after the events of the summer and how that information might be brought to our management team and advisory subpanel at some point this year, next spring? But yeah, depending on how things go in the international forums, I really think that information is still being absorbed even by us at WDFW, so more time with it. I think to summarize it, what you can really do is think through some scenarios of what would happen if albacore dropped and look at different effort levels and how to get....dig out of that hole and it's, the information is all there and if someone skilled in it, like Dr. Teo or others, could really run people through some scenarios that makes these situations more concrete. And this is the longest question ever probably, but I'm hoping you all can maybe think about that possibility again after the summer and maybe the fall or early next year if still relevant.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:25] Thank you. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:20:28] Yeah, through the Chair, thank you Mr. Niles for the question. So the short answer is yes, we can do that, and I think it's appropriate. If I'm guessing correctly, we will most likely leave this summer with some further understanding where the international positions are, but some very technical questions that are still out there in front of us before we can complete a strategy, and so we presented some of those to, as you noted, to the stakeholder webinars. Appreciate your compliments on how we've done that, but that is something, especially if it's still

outstanding, we could work on presenting in more detail through the MTs and to the Council at a future meeting either late this fall in November or early spring.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:11] Thank you. Look around here. Just want to check back the comment by Miss Evenson on the use of the term or the construct of the convention area, if that was captured? I think that that was to NMFS. It didn't need a motion, but we're good there? Thank you. And not seeing any hands, I think Gilly, how did we do?

Gilly Lyons [00:21:41] Thank you Mr. Chair. I think you did great. You've received several updates on international HMS activities and upcoming meetings and considered detailed recommendations from the HMSAS. And you've adopted a motion to provide recommendations on U.S. positions to U.S. Delegations at their upcoming international meetings. And with that, I think your work on this agenda item is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:04] All right, thank you. With that, I don't see any other hands, we're going to close out this agenda item.