DRAFT COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
283rd Session of the
Pacific Fishery Management Council
September 17-24, 2025

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

A. Call to Order 4
4. Agenda 4
B. Open Comment Period 8
1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items 8
C. Habitat Issues 9
1. Current Habitat Issues 9
D. Highly Migratory Species Management 11
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report 11
2. International Management Activities 13
E. Pacific Halibut Management 16
1. 2026 Commercial and Recreational Catch Sharing Plan and Annual Regulations-Preliminary 16
F. Salmon Management 21
1. Methodology Review-Final Topic Selection 21
G. Groundfish Management 30
1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report 30
2. Phase 2 Stock Definitions-Final Action 31
3. Adopt Stock Assessments 49
4. Stock Assessment Methodology Topic Selection-Final Topics 57
5. Trawl Catch Share Program Review-Preliminary 59
6. Initial Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Actions for 2027-28 63
7. Inseason Adjustments-Final Action 68
8. Emergency Action: Revised 2026 Specifications and Measures for Canary Rockfish, Shortspine Thornyhead, and Petrale Sole - Final Action 70
H. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP) 74
1. Adaptive Management and Flexibility - Scoping 74
2. Council Response to Executive Order and Administration Updates 88
I. Administrative Matters 108
1. Fiscal Matters 108
2. Approve Council Meeting Record 110

3. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures 111
4. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning..... 118

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

4. Agenda

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] Thank you very much. We've had an agenda published, a draft agenda published in the briefing book. See if there's any discussion or a motion to set our agenda before us? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:18] Mr. Chairman, if there is no further discussion I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:23] All right, please go ahead.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:28] I move the Council approve the agenda presented as A.4 in the September 2025 briefing book.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:37] Thank you. That all looks accurate and complete on the screen, you agree?

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:40] Yes Mr. Chairman.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:41] Thank you. Seconded by David Sones. Speak to your motion as necessary.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:45] Mr. Chairman, I think it's fairly self-explanatory.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:50] Thank you. I will look around. Any discussion on this item? Not seeing any hands, I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:00:59] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:01] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you very much.....(AGENDA ITEM REVISITED).....

Butch Smith [00:01:09] Aja, I think now is the appropriate time to raise your hand.

Aja Szumylo [00:01:15] Thank you. And now with that, I have a motion. So the first motion I have is, I move that the Council reconsider the adoption of Agenda Item A.4, September 2025 Council Meeting Agenda.

Butch Smith [00:01:33] I do believe this is a simple motion, thumbs up, thumbs down with all the others.

Sharon Kiefer [00:01:41] Mr. Vice-Chair, for the second.

Butch Smith [00:01:42] Okay, thank you. Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. All right. Get you to speak to your.....or does your motion?

Aja Szumylo [00:01:59] This largely covers it, but I'd like to reopen the agenda to consider adding a broader discussion to address some of the things that we heard under open public comment today.

Butch Smith [00:02:09] Okay, thank you. So I guess I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:02:20] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:02:22] Those opposed? Any abstentions? Hearing none, it looks like the motion carries unanimously. Thank you. Yes, Aja?

Aja Szumylo [00:02:37] And then I have another motion. So I move the Council amend Agenda Item A.4 to add an agenda item to consider an emergency rule to update the 2026 harvest specifications and management measures for canary rockfish, shortspine thornyhead and petrale sole. This new agenda item would be considered after Agenda Item G.7, Groundfish Inseason.

Butch Smith [00:03:05] Okay, before I ask for the second, does your motion reflect what you said on the screen there?

Aja Szumylo [00:03:12] Yes it does.

Butch Smith [00:03:15] Alrighty. Can I get a second on that motion? Seconded by Brad Pettinger. Any question of the motion maker I believe? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:03:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Welcome. Thanks Miss Szumylo. My question for you is just a little bit on your intent of what this agenda item might look like. You know what analysis do you expect to come with it? What sorts of things do you want to come forward as? Just getting my head around what this agenda item might actually include. Thank you.

Aja Szumylo [00:03:57] Thank you Miss Ridings. And I'm wondering if that can be addressed to some degree in the rationale that I have or, yeah, maybe it'll be covered somewhat there. Okay. I guess if there are any other clarifying questions on the motion happy to answer those.

Butch Smith [00:04:17] Go ahead and speak to your motion please.

Aja Szumylo [00:04:21] Okay. So yeah, remind me to get to what you just asked, but beyond the open public comment at this meeting there's been a really big through line of open public comment across the meetings this year, and momentum of action from this Council throughout the year all finally capped by the recently available scientific information from the catch-only projections that these small increases to the annual specifications for petrale sole, shortspine thornyhead, and canary rockfish won't have any negative impact on the long-term health of those stocks. The commenters discussed today that these three species are important across all groundfish sectors in all three states. And that their combined reductions for 2025 and 2026 have created a new significant challenge for the fishery. The brand new information we have is the catch-only projections. There are new projections for 2026, but the unforeseen circumstances of the magnitude of the impacts and the combined decreases is the need, is the driver for the emergency. So the new information paired with these large impacts that we weren't anticipating when we took final action on specifications back in November of 2023. Industry has raised alarm bells about this throughout the year and I won't spend time recapping that. I think we can spend that time in discussion later on when we get to the agenda item that I'm proposing that we bring up later. But there are these really small increases that we're talking about that won't affect the stocks and the long-term health of the stocks, but they have this really big potential to increase operational capabilities, operational flexibilities for the groundfish sectors throughout the fishing year while we're working hard, while the Council's working hard on all these other actions like the specifications flexibility action that could ultimately open up the space to create this flexibility without emergency later on. I think this meets the need for the criteria for emergency action consideration. We can discuss that further and that's one of the things that I would hope to discuss under the agenda item. So looking at the catch-only projections, thinking about whether or not we all collectively see that there's not this

potential for long-term harm to the stocks, plus also considering the broader commentary from industry that they've been providing throughout the year. People are planning for their fishing years for 2026 right now. They're planning their allocation portfolios and for their fishing activities for area management to avoid these species. The time that it would take to complete notice and comment rulemaking or complete a larger action that would take multiple meetings would be significant. And the changes that are necessary would go into effect well after they'd be beneficial for the entire fleet for the entirely year. So while.....again, at this point with the information that I've seen so far, and this is what I'd like to discuss with everybody, I don't see a conservation risk with the increases in question. But the actions, these changes could have significant direct economic benefit and social benefit to the fisheries that we're dealing with. And so, yeah, the motion here is just asking for that space for that consideration discussion. And yeah, we're just looking for agreement for that, not agreement to make the recommendation right now to NOAA to do an emergency, but agreement to create the space for the discussion later in this meeting. So I'll stop there.

Butch Smith [00:07:59] Thank you. Before we go into discussion, any more questions of the motion maker? Okay, seeing nothing we're in Council discussion now. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:08:16] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'd just like to say that I definitely support adding this to the inseason agenda as an emergency rule proposal. I believe this is very much in line with what the public has asked for over the years, this type of ability, and unfortunately right now it has to be in an e-rule format. But I believe.....you know we talk about overly burdensome management, reduction of flexibility in fisheries to be able to pivot because they're having to avoid things that aren't even necessarily a target, recreational fisheries that are running really tight on ACLs for different species that allow them to attain other species, and so I think this is a really important opportunity to show the public especially, to show our stakeholders, like we see these opportunities and we're willing to go there to provide more access and opportunity, or at least to explore the possibility of that when it's so glaringly possible. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:09:35] Thank you Miss Diamond. Anyone else? Corey.

Corey Ridings [00:09:41] Thanks Vice. My question I think, and thanks Miss Szumylo for providing that during your rationale, I think my question is for Council staff. If this was to move forward, would we expect to have some sort of analysis from the GMT or Council staff or NMFS staff to help us weigh the pros and cons of what might come from that discussion, or just have some things to base that discussion on? Maybe that already exists somewhere and we can just have it be pointed to. But just curious sort of, this is not typical for the Council, so just trying to figure out what sort of materials will be available for us when we enter this discussion?

Butch Smith [00:10:25] That's a question for you Executive Director.

Merrick Burden [00:10:27] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman, and thanks for the question Miss Ridings. So if this motion passes we're prepared to do several things, and then we'll have several other things coming from some advisory bodies. So what we'll do is we will update the agenda and we'll post that so that everyone has access to the new agenda online. We'll have a Situation Summary so that when we get to this agenda item we'll have the usual course of things and you'll see what your action is and what you're considering. We will have.....we have Jessi already teed up to help identify what the allocations to each fishery would look like if you get to this emergency item and it passes. In June you asked the SSC to take a look at some revised projections. I think we started to anticipate maybe they're just coming at that time, so we've already queued up the SSC to look at these revised projections and make sure that that's scientifically rigorous and meets the BSIA criteria. So you'll hear from them. And then we would have the GMT and the GAP provide statements to you helping to justify or not whether

this meets the criteria for an emergency rule. So you'll have quite a bit of things coming your way if this passes.

Butch Smith [00:11:54] Thank you Merrick. Any other questions or discussion? Sorry. I guess I'll call for the question then. Okay, all those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:12:11] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:12:11] Any opposed? Abstentions? Hearing none, the motion passes. Thank you.

B. Open Comment Period

1. Comments on Non-Agenda Items

No transcription for the agenda item.

C. Habitat Issues

1. Current Habitat Issues

Butch Smith [00:00:00] Any Council discussion on this, further on this topic? Marci. Sorry, Miss Yaremko. I apologize. I'll get this.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:12] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. There's a lot to talk about under this agenda item. And first, I want to shout out to the sanctuaries. I have not, that I can ever recall, seen a nice clear detailed response in our record to questions that we've previously posed, and it's great. It's clear. It's very responsive. And again, it just reflects, I think, the ongoing commitment that the sanctuary office has to participating in our process and just want to acknowledge my appreciation for that. And it's great to hear Lisa virtually, and we'll look forward to seeing sanctuaries present to us on their annual report in March. So thanks for that. The Habitat Committee Report, I also want to just recognize kind of the suite of items that are included in the updates and activities sections, several of which have been of interest to the Council over quite a long term. I'm not sure who all to thank for providing discussions into the Habitat Committee room, but I think this really does speak to the importance of the Habitat Committee as an advisory body to us. This is a, you know there's not going to be a single agency or a single individual that is going to be able to present this type of a comprehensive overview of ongoing activities, and so I just want to thank them for that. And just to acknowledge that I really appreciate the specific updates on California. I'm not as tuned into some of the networks that the folks on the Habitat Committee are, and it is really a great service that they provide to us to keep us up to date on so many different things that are critical to our habitat and how important these things are to our considerations on EFH and on habitat more generally. Looking at the California item and the update on the long term operations of the CVP, I appreciate Dr. Heppell's responses to Corey Ridings inquiry. I do want to hear more in November. I do want to acknowledge the history that our Council has on writing letters on this topic to Bureau of Reclamation and expressing our concerns. These major changes that have been identified in this report are quite alarming. As much as we are doing on our side to conserve salmon resources and give our habitat an opportunity as necessary to restore in the face of climate events, this list is quite concerning. Salt water intrusion, revised entrainment management that no longer requires minimization of juvenile salmonids and other species, getting rid of notice and comment rulemaking, optional public comment periods, these things are alarming. I don't know how else to say it. And I'm not sure what we do about this. I do think we have a strong history of commenting on content related to the long term operations of the CVP, so I think the time may come again for more comment or other, perhaps working in other venues. But again I just, I can't appreciate enough the offers of the Habitat Committee to continue to keep us apprised. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:04:42] Thank you Miss Yaremko. Mrs. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:04:47] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I want to echo the advice we had this morning from our Chair saying let's carry the spirit of Joel forward as we go through our work. And I can't imagine not making a strong comment on the floor, echoing what Miss Yaremko just said. But I witnessed last year for the first time the process of managing salmon fisheries and people were in tears. It's so difficult. There's so few fish, and we try so hard to do it right. And I've also witnessed firsthand recreational and commercial operators who work in the rivers trying to bring these salmonids up and down and putting hatcheries in. Everybody's trying so hard, but we all know we can't do it because there are bigger forces at work. Marci provided the list of those, but these are profound impacts on our program. It's like pushing that wet noodle uphill. We're really struggling when we don't have the water quantity, quality, protection for salmonids. We have a number of projects, really good projects, many of which included tribal programs. We've got categorical exclusions. It's just, it's disbanding of scientific committees. How are we supposed to succeed at our job when these forces are working against

a healthy, sustainable salmon fishery? It's discouraging. I commend Dr. Heppell for reading that report in such a peppy voice, but I really hope that for the record it's noted that this Council is discouraged and disheartened. And I don't know how we turn around the next year during the salmon process and put our nose to the grindstone and manage fisheries, putting people out of business, profound socioeconomic impacts up and down the coast. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:06:51] Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Mr. John North.

John North [00:07:00] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair. In regards to that Notice Of Intent on the Port of Coos Bay Channel Mod Environmental Impact Statement, I just want to make clear that ODFW does support providing comments via the Habitat Committee on that, given the potential impacts from the dredging and the dredge spoils disposal out in the ocean, and also from railway upgrades that could impact a lot of freshwater salmon habitat. And I don't really have a preference if we provide that guidance for a quick response now or in November, either way works for me. I just was just wondering if we'd know anymore?

Butch Smith [00:07:49] Is there a question for Merrick there? Is that a question or a statement? Yes Mr. Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:02] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah John, on that as I read it, and I scroll back up, but I think the Notice Of Intent is probably going to come out in December. Is that correct? So we still have the November meeting so it's on our radar screen. And we'll hear from, I suspect we'll here from the Habitat Committee again. And without even having the Notice Of Intent yet we can sort of keep it in the back of our minds, but be prepared to act on that.

John North [00:08:39] Thank you for that clarification. Appreciate it.

Butch Smith [00:08:47] Miss Corey Riding.

Corey Ridings [00:08:48] Thanks Vice. Just a quick comment to ask the Habitat Committee to continue to update the Council on the RCBA litigation, if and how that moves forward and whenever that's appropriate.

Butch Smith [00:09:09] Okay, any further questions or comments? Alrighty, seeing none I will close this agenda item out.

D. Highly Migratory Species Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Butch Smith [00:00:00] Kerry, how are we doing here?

Kerry Griffin [00:00:03] I think you're doing fine. There was no public comment. I don't know if there's going to be more Council discussion, but real quickly, most of you probably realized I jumped ahead a little bit. There is no HMSAS Report under this or update from WCPFC rep. I was looking at the next agenda item, but I think there might be more Council discussion under this one first.

Butch Smith [00:00:34] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:00:34] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, not much discussion, but I just want to.... well when Ryan said he hadn't had the time to get in the details on the comparability findings I wasn't going to press, but I was interested in what Dr. Lent had to say and wondering what we can understand more in the future about how this.....you know it's been a big topic about how, for swordfish in particular for those who are new, and how the fairness of the way we regulate our fisheries versus what other countries do, and so, yeah, I was curious whether this would have any effect at all. I'm maybe disappointed to hear that it's not having much of effect. But it would be.....yeah I just wanted to echo on what the thread Dr. Lent was going on and when appropriate in the future it would nice to have some more information on how this is affecting the fisheries managed here at the Council.

Butch Smith [00:01:36] Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:01:37] Yeah thanks. Through the Vice-Chair, thanks Corey for the comments. Yeah, I mean I haven't done a really detailed analysis. I mean if you look at them, at least on first blush, there's a lot of gillnets fisheries that didn't receive comparability finding to some extent, some diversal long lines and things like that, but yeah, I'm not seeing as much on the potential fleets that we would import, for example swordfish from, and maybe that's because it's a marine mammal focus versus turtles or other protected resources focus. But again, this is something we're just digesting too, even me and my staff, so happy to try and dig into this a little bit more and maybe provide some more details and information both from a region and headquarters perspective at the next meeting.

Butch Smith [00:02:33] Thank you Ryan. Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yes, just echoing what others have said I think along the lines of the questioning of Dr. Lent and Miss Svensson and Corey Niles their information. I guess the only maybe different message I would add to it is I'm curious if these import restrictions create any type of gap in supply of fish that could be satisfied by U.S. domestic fisheries, you know our West Coast Fisheries. And I think what we've directed and Ryan said that they would be looking into, we might get to some of that. Just haven't looked ahead under this one to HMS topics in November, but the advisory subpanel.....I mean I had an opportunity to talk to a few of the people in the fishery, not all of them were on the subpanel but some are, and they have a lot of knowledge about markets and fish and what's happening, and for this Council, you know is there a gap that we should be aware of that our domestic fisheries that we should take some consideration? So add that into the mix of information. Thanks.

Butch Smith [00:04:01] Thank you Mr. Chair. Ryan.

Ryan Wulff [00:04:05] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer for the comments. Completely, I do think that that needs to be added to the discussion as well, right? We currently import over 80% of our swordfish and over 70% of our bluefin, so yeah, there's a supply gap for sure from West Coast Fisheries.

Butch Smith [00:04:28] Thank you. Anymore? Christa or Miss Svensson, sorry.

Christa Svensson [00:04:32] Thank you. And really I just want to thank everybody for leaning in and engaging on this topic. It's surfaced under HMS fisheries, but I do really appreciate the comments from Dr. Lent around a, it might be worthwhile for an analysis of fisheries outside of HMS. I'm just going to real quickly here read the title of an article to get at our Chair's question around domestic. This is the article in Undercurrents if you want to read a little more about what this means for some importers, it's called, "U.S. Foreign Fisheries Ban Threatens Death Punch to Swimming Crab Importers". So I would probably argue that there is room for crab in some way, shape, or form, depending on price point. I think the impact for fisheries that are used to importing into the United States that no longer have that ability probably is very significant. I will say having worked for a company that does import tuna into the United States, this has been on our radar for five years. It has been a major topic of conversation in terms of concern around how to support U.S. markets, whether that's with U.S. product or with imports, and we do both, I will say that. But I think having a clearer understanding in a database, if possible, that is searchable for people would be really beneficial. And I don't know that the ability is there in terms of resources. I think the ability absolutely is there in terms talent with the folks that have worked on this process. But I do recognize even from comments earlier this morning that our resources are limited. But I think as we work through this it will be important to continue thinking about how all of the fish and fisheries that we are working on really work together, right? So topics come up under HMS and they may be applicable elsewhere. Topics come up under groundfish, they may applicable in other FMPs. But that ability to lean in and learn from each other is important. And I think the list of foreign fisheries has been really great in terms of starting those conversations. So just once again Ryan, thanks for all of the work your team has done on this and thanks for helping start the discussion today about it.

Butch Smith [00:07:27] Thank you Miss Svensson. You got any comment from that Ryan?

Ryan Wulff [00:07:32] No, just thank you. I appreciate the comments.

Butch Smith [00:07:34] Alrighty. Any more comment? I see no public comment. Am I seeing that guys back there? No public comment still? Alrighty. Well, I think we've wrapped this up.

2. International Management Activities

Butch Smith [00:00:00] So now we're into Council discussion where I understand that we're, it can be direction, it could be a motion, it could be whatever the Council decides. So I would open the floor and entertain some of that riveting discussion that we're about to have. Christa. Miss Svensson, excuse me.

Christa Svensson [00:00:25] Yeah, no I'd be happy to start the discussion. If memory serves on this particular topic, we have usually just gone with recommendations rather than a full-fledged motion so I do not have one prepared, although I could put one together really quickly if you have a change of heart. In listening to Mr. Conroy's comments with regard to the question about, hey if we did consider putting this advisory report in as a submission to the PAC, what about including June's for really that full suite? And his essentially recommendation of, hey, he didn't think that that would be a bad idea, that it would help in terms of giving additional people who may not be as familiar with what our needs are for North Pacific albacore and other fisheries that are related to the west coast, I would be very supportive of putting that forward as a recommendation. I don't think we have a ton of other recommendations for international agenda items at this meeting. I'll just note that November is usually the heavy one for what comes out of that PAC meeting in October and gearing up for what the decisions and talking points will be in December. So I guess looking for others to say, yep, I'd also be interested in that recommendation and if people do feel strongly about a motion I will get busy sending something over to Mr. York and others in the back.

Butch Smith [00:02:18] Mr. Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:02:19] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair and thanks Miss Svensson for that. I agree. I think you mentioned in your comments that tomorrow is the deadline, and so looking to Merrick in terms of could we turn around and with a very simple cover note submit our advisory subpanels reports from this meeting in June to the PAC as recommendations from this Council? I would be supportive of that. I just....kind of curious if it's possible?

Butch Smith [00:02:58] Mr. Director.

Merrick Burden [00:02:59] Yeah, I appreciate the question. I think that's reasonable to do. I'll just look at Kerry because I'd ask Kerry to take the lead on that. And he, as we know, is a master at drafting letters at this point, so I think that's doable Mr. Ugoretz.

Kerry Griffin [00:03:15] Yeah, thank you. I like your word choice of a short cover letter. That can be pulled together pretty easily. And then I think you're talking about attaching this HMSAS Report as well as the June HMSAS Report to that cover letter. Okay, thank you. Sure, no problem.

Butch Smith [00:03:39] Is that okay with the other.....oh, I'm sorry John.

John Ugoretz [00:03:41] No, I was going to say thank you, that would be great. And I'd look to Christa to see if she agrees, but....

Christa Svensson [00:03:48] I would be very agreeable. And Kerry if you need some help with drafting a very short cover letter that essentially says this is from the Pacific Fisheries Management Council and the two attachments are related, et cetera. Not looking to be lengthy on that one, but happy to help support you Kerry if you need it.

Butch Smith [00:04:10] So I don't want to cut off any discussion, but I'm starting to hear some

consensus on this and direction on this. If someone else has a little more to add or a lot more to add? Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:04:24] Thank you very much Mr. Vice-Chair. Just to make sure, do those two attachments mention the U.S.- Korea proposal on handling and release of citations, because it's not in the HMSAS paper.

Butch Smith [00:04:44] Miss Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:04:44] Yeah, I would need to confirm about that in the June. I don't believe that they do. If that is something that this Council would like to see, if there is information around that then I would perhaps recommend that we include it. Otherwise the alternative, and it would not come from the Council, would be to attend the meeting and give public comment with regard to that specifically. So not, certainly not trying to cut you off and certainly happy to include it if that is the will of the Council.

Butch Smith [00:05:24] Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:05:26] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I guess it's complicated as Mr. Wulff said because of the overlap with the ADCP, the dolphin agreement. So maybe we should just leave it for the delegation to handle on the floor. Thank you. I withdraw my suggestion.

Butch Smith [00:05:42] Okay, so I'm seeing a direction and a path forward. Kerry I would ask you, one, do you have enough direction to move in the direction that the Council has consented to? And two, your second part, so I'm going to ask you again, did we complete our task under this item? So take it away Mr. Griffin.

Kerry Griffin [00:06:11] Thank you. Yes, I have enough to go with. I think I could draft something up and share it with leadership and Christa and make sure that we're on the right track and that should be pretty simple to do. But I also do see another hand up, so I don't want to a.....

Butch Smith [00:06:33] Where's the hand. I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

Corey Niles [00:06:35] Like the Chair said, you've got to keep your head on a swivel up there. But I just had one comment, question for NMFS and it sounded like there was some communication on the North Pacific albacore and some stakeholder engagement and I'm sure you're planning on it anyway Ryan, but just a request, if we could hear back about that in November that would be appreciated. It would....do think those stakeholder engagement opportunities and Mike's suggestion in December, January made sense to me a but.....

Butch Smith [00:07:08] Thank you, thank you Mr. Niles. All right Kerry have we....

Kerry Griffin [00:07:15] I see a hand up by Mr. Wulff.

Butch Smith [00:07:22] Oh, Mr. Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:07:22] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Yeah, and thanks Mr. Niles for the comment. Yeah, we'll definitely report back. We hear kind of the recommendation kind of towards a December-ish or a winter meeting. We may end up having to schedule more than one discussion, right, because I don't think we're going have the work done from the ISC on the impacts to fleets that was noted by, also by Mike Conroy in his report, until maybe by June. We may also have the stock assessment update by

June. So we may have to do this in a couple of sessions, if you will, but there's no reason to wait all the way till June just to start talking. So we'll reach out and continue to work with the industry on setting that up and we'll communicate to all those interested when we do. And then, of course, report back here to the Council after we've started those discussions.

Corey Niles [00:08:16] Yeah, thanks. Much appreciated Ryan.

Butch Smith [00:08:18] Thank you Mr. Wulff. Okay, so looking around here. All right Kerry have we finished this, completed this agenda item?

Kerry Griffin [00:08:28] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It looks like you have completed your business. I don't see any more hands up and you had a good Council discussion and I will draft up this brief cover letter and we'll get that buttoned up and ready to submit no later than tomorrow.

Butch Smith [00:08:44] All right, thank you. So it looks like I will be handing back the gavel to the Chairman on Pacific halibut management. Mr. Chairman it's all yours.

E. Pacific Halibut Management

1. 2026 Commercial and Recreational Catch Sharing Plan and Annual Regulations-Preliminary

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That concludes our reports and public comment and will take us to Council action. We'll wait for that to flash on the screen to refresh us. And there it is, a simple review and discuss the update on inseason actions, and then review and adopt for public review proposed changes to the 2026 Catch Sharing Plan. So who wants to start the discussion? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:33] Thank you Chair. I just wanted to really acknowledge and thank NMFS for their work, particularly on the directed commercial fishery this season. Heather Fitch in particular was really communicative with ODFW staff and really helped coordinate getting the data collected so that the seasons could turn around really quickly. She also really helped facilitate the inseason call and moving some fish around when the Columbia River needed that. So I know oftentimes we're critical of NMFS, but I wanted to pass along some thanks for the effort. Additionally, on the changing of the license application date. It's not ideal but it's better than it was, and I know that puts a time crunch on NMFS, but it should help our fleet being able to make some informed decisions. I do want to go back just a moment to the questions that Dr. Lent asked us a little bit ago about the directed commercial fishery, and then Butch kind of hit on, or Mr. Smith hit on some of it. We changed that fishery from 10-hour derby openings to three-day openings six, seven, eight years ago. 8 a.m. on day one to 6 p.m. on day three. That way the fishery starts and ends during daylight hours for some enforcement issues. We originally had that fishery Monday through Wednesday, however the fleet indicated it was costing them more and was difficult to get ice on Sundays, so they requested we move it Tuesday to Thursday, that would allow them to get ice on Mondays and then go fishing Tuesday and Thursday, and then they would still be able to deliver their catches fresh in the ports. Like Vice-Chair Smith said, there's a lot of activity on the weekends, people selling fresh off their boat. And that is how that season has been set up the last, I think, three years now and seems to be working reasonably well. There's always improvements. But just to give a little background on how the season got set up that way, and there was actually some logic in the start date and the end time, making it easier and less expensive as well as providing for the fresh markets. When it comes time, I believe Miss Diamond has some questions, but when it comes time I have a motion to cover at least part of Council task number 2 when we're ready.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:54] All right, thank you Lynn. Let me look to the right. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:03:01] Yeah, I'd just like to take a second to comment regarding the inseason actions that have been taken in the arena in the sidebar. That was based on some Council recommendations that we made a few years ago about taking inventory in mid-August to evaluate needs in the recreational sectors and if there's need to move fish. And I just want to voice appreciation from California, even though we haven't participated in moving a fish to date under this provision, that I do think it has done quite a bit to improve flexibility and to maintain fishery season lengths as scheduled as best as possible. And so I just want to commend NMFS and Council staff for spooling up these calls that have gone on in the background and the discussions, and I think it's really a great step forward and certainly has helped us all, I think, share and better utilize our two-way TAC. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:10] Thank you. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:04:11] Thank you Chair Hassemer. And I'll keep this brief, but I did want to echo some of the appreciation that Miss Mattes offered to NMFS. And I know that we keep working and refining how we're doing this and building in flexibility where we can in a way that is transparent to

the public and works for NMFS. And there's been a lot of really good communication throughout the season, post-season, and all of that. And then I also wanted to speak to the inseason sharing opportunity that came up a couple of years ago that we implemented. I certainly at the time did not expect that Washington would be the recipient of extra quota. We were putting it forward and thinking that we'd be able to share it with others and so it's been really nice to have it there. I look forward to seeing it go both ways, but it has been really helpful to us in keeping our season open through the end of September, which is when our recreational sport fishery closes. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:23] Thank you. Other hands? Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:05:30] Thank you. So it's kind of a late catch, and it was something that kind of got flagged for me, looking at the GAP Report, they in their recommendation it says, "they recommend the proposed changes", but in the WDFW and ODFW Report, but there's multiple options for changes. And so I'm just won.....and then there's the SAS that says status quo all the way. So I don't know enough about the intricacies of what is best for your stakeholders, but with multiple options and just a recommendation of yeah, I'm wondering if we can get some clarification.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:21] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:06:23] Thank you Chair Hassemer. And I could just start by saying the way we put all the options in our report for this point in time is to have a broad range of alternatives that we're going to look at between now and November. So we'll do some analysis in-house and get our stakeholders back together in October and say, this is what this looks at like. So we'll be wanting to move all the options forward for public review at this point.

Jaime Diamond [00:06:55] Thank you.

Heather Hall [00:06:56] Hope that's helpful.

Jaime Diamond [00:06:56] I appreciate that.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:02] All right, thanks. Other discussion? I'm not seeing any. I'm going to look back to Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:09] Thank you Chair. I do have a motion that I believe the tower of power has that covers I think most of this. So I move that the Council adopt for public review the status quo directed commercial fishery season structure and the proposals in the WDFW and ODFW Reports.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:33] Thank you. I read along. That appears accurate and complete.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:36] Yes sir, it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:37] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Heather Hall. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:42] Thank you Chair. I think we've had some discussion about this and Miss Hall explained a little bit more about the halibut process and it's slightly tweaked, slightly different than a regular process, putting this stuff out for public review and then we come back in November for final action. So this is just putting forward basically everything we've heard from WDFW and ODFW thus far, and then the status quo fishery, which we haven't heard any proposed changes for that. And then we will bring back more information in November. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:20] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Looking carefully, not seeing any. Any discussion on the motion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:08:34] Thank you Chair Hassemer. And thank you for the motion Lynn. I'll be supporting it obviously. I did want to just maybe elaborate a little bit on the range of alternatives that are in the WDFW Report. It does include status quo and several different options. And what we expect can come out of it could be a mix of those things in terms of what our final recommendation would be. In particular, I wanted to talk about status quo relative to our Puget Sound subarea that would open in very early April. This was really challenging for us, I guess, and NMFS in terms of the turnaround to get that April 1 opening in place, or the April 3rd opening for 2025 in place. I think the rule was posted the day before our fishery opened so we were wondering what were we going to do if the federal rule wasn't in place? So I just wanted to flag that, that we may, through this public review process, consider pushing that date out a bit, and I'm saying that for the benefit of the stakeholders and folks that are online. We'll talk about that during that October meeting. And just wanted to acknowledge that that was really a tight turnaround. Also in our conversations with NMFS, we're thinking long term how do we do that in a way where we can have more certainty about that opening date. And I think there's some things that we can look at for beyond 2026, but just flagging that for now that that would be included in our range of alternatives.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:30] Thank you. Any further discussion? Seeing no discus.....no hands. Oh, wait. Where is it? I have to figure out why it's not showing up on my screen here. Who has their hand raised?

Hayden York (off-mic) [00:10:56] Josh Lindsay.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:59] Oh, Josh Lindsay, go ahead.

Josh Lindsay [00:11:04] Apologies Mr. Chair. It's always the virtual guy messing things up. I just wanted to briefly thank Heather for that acknowledgement. I do plan to support this motion, but as the agency has been discussing with WDFW, these early April dates are becoming increasingly difficult for the agency to implement that CSP rule by. This is largely due to the timing of when the annual IPHC regs, regulations get put in place, which is in mid-March, and so that is quick turnaround for us between that date and early April. As Miss Hall referenced, yes the rule got in place one day before the timing of the opener. So plan to continue to work with WDFW on this. Appreciate the acknowledgement that maybe a new date or a different date might come about. And I guess while I'm unmuted, I guess I would speak similarly to the proposal regarding California agencies open to looking towards long-term solutions to this, but sort of the annual implementation timeline that's moved away from, as the CSP notes, May starts to these April starts are difficult, and as Miss Hall mentioned, create a lot of uncertainty both regulatorily and for the fishing public, and so we'd like to explore some options there. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:47] Thank you. With that, any other discussion? Now I don't see any hands so I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:13:02] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:05] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. Is there further work here? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:23] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I also have a motion ready I believe. Excellent, thank you. I move the Council forward for public review a proposed change to the Catch Sharing Plan for the California recreational fishery that would establish the start date in each California subarea as

April 1 of each year.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:48] And that language appears accurate and complete?

Marci Yaremko [00:13:51] Yes it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:52] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Jaime Diamond. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:13:58] Yes, thank you Chair Hassemer. I want to acknowledge Josh's remarks and just appreciate the quick coordination work both on the part of Josh as well as Heather to catch me up on the discussions that they've been having on this topic for a little while now. And I'll be honest, we had been talking about this this morning in delegation and I wasn't optimistic that we'd be able to consider it for this year, so we realize we're a little late to the game here. We don't have a CDFW Report at this point, but this is moving forward with our preliminary alternatives for public review. So I think we will be working as well on the sidelines with NMFS on what possible regulatory approaches allow for these early April opening dates. Completely understand that the time and the road jam with the various regs that come into play in March and early April, and anything we can do to assist with that, help think through things, we will certainly be there and appreciate everyone's consideration here. And I want to just acknowledge Tim's remarks and how important this measure would be to allow for alignment of the opening dates for halibut with our all-depth groundfish season and the ability to have flexibility to target multiple species on a trip. As he expressed, we've had so many challenges on the North Coast and whether it's salmon or halibut or groundfish and throughout this year through the Council process under all these agenda items about this need to reinvigorate our communities, and thought Tim hit on it talking about the kickstart and how these opportunities early in the season hopefully can entice and attract folks to come aboard into the spring and summer and fall. I can just imagine a scenario where finally we've provided opportunities for all-depth groundfish in April, and gosh what happens if you catch a halibut and you have to tell someone they have to throw it back because we didn't have that opportunity open. So anyway, we know we can never or often can't perfectly align things, but having that ability to co-target really I think will be important. So appreciate the opportunity to add that here.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:51] All right, thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? I'm not seeing any questions. Discussion on the motion? Seeing no hands for the discussion. Better look online. Nothing there. I will call the question. Well, now there is one online. Honestly, this is not showing up here. All right, who was it? Josh? Josh, did you want to comment?

Josh Lindsay [00:17:30] Sorry Mr. Chair. I guess I probably don't need to reiterate myself. I just wanted to, the things I mentioned previously, I plan to support this motion as well and happy to work with CDFW on some potentials for a change to this start date, recognizing that this April 1 date specific may be difficult for this coming fishing year. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:59] All right, thank you. Now I'll look around once more carefully. Seeing no hands I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:18:07] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:11] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. And now I will again look around and see if there is anything else here? And while you're thinking about that we can come back for any closing comments, but I will first ask Angela if there's anything else we should be taking on here. Angela.

Angela Forristall [00:18:42] Thank you Mr. Chair. No, if there's no further input from Council members, you have adopted for public review a status quo season structure for the directed commercial halibut fishery and the proposed changes outlined in the Oregon and Washington reports, as well as the proposal to move the California season start dates for those subareas. We'd come back in November for final action on changes for the Catch Sharing Plan for 2026, but as far as I am concerned to your action on this agenda item is complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:15] All right, thank you. Let me look around the table once more to see if there are any last comments to be made. And I'm not seeing any so we will close out this agenda item. Thank you all for that work.

F. Salmon Management

1. Methodology Review-Final Topic Selection

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports, the public comment, will take us into discussion. We've heard a lot. We've been at it a little over an hour. Let's take 10 minutes so you can organize your thoughts. Get ready to come back and engage in discussion and our Council action. So 10 minutes.....(BREAK).....Thanks all for coming back. We'll move into our discussion. And I'm not sure who's ready to raise their hand first. And I saw someone online volunteer themselves. Kyle Adicks.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:41] Thank you Chair Hassemer. I'll just confirm my mic is working before I start.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:46] Perfectly. Please proceed.

Kyle Adicks [00:00:48] All right, thank you. I wanted to comment on three different things. I'll start with the OPIH coho forecast since I was involved in bringing the adjustment to the methodology forward back in March. When we brought that forward back in March, WDFW and ODFW, I made the argument that I didn't think it merited full methodology review under the Council Operating Procedure. I acknowledge that there was interest in continuing to investigate that forecast and make further changes to it at the March meeting. And I think at the April meeting I said that I was, I was afraid we wouldn't have time to do anything more than the adjustment we brought to the March meetings because of staff workloads, U.S. v. Oregon management agreement being renegotiated and taking up a lot of people's time. So what's potentially being brought forward is essentially a more comprehensive write-up of what we brought to that March meeting. The SSC statement seems to agree that what was brought to the Council in March does not merit full review under the Council Operating Procedures. But we also heard some comments in March about the desire to provide full transparency and review by bringing that method through the process. I'm okay either way with this. If we want to put this into review, we'll have some documentation ready that we can bring forward. If the Council's desire is to save review for a future year when we have, may have more substantial changes to the method that clearly meet the threshold, I'm fine with waiting and doing that later too. On the OCN coho forecast, I support reviewing the changes to the methods for the Marine Survival Index as brought forward by ODFW. It's unfortunate we're losing some data gathering capacity there as we are in other places, but it's good that ODFW's got something to bring forward as we face that new reality. The last thing I wanted to comment on was Item 5 from the SSC Report. A lot of questions about that as we step through the advisory body reports. I have some concerns related to the scope and application of what they're proposing, and I probably don't have a full understanding of exactly what it is they are proposing. One of my concerns is I don't fully understand how it fits into the normal Salmon Methodology Review process or how it fits beyond helping with the Sacramento Work Group process. But my bigger concern is how this item fits within the U.S. v. Washington co-manager process. The forecast and forecast evaluation for the watersheds in the U.S. v. Washington case area fall under the purview of the co-managers, not any other entity. So I have some serious concerns with how Item number 5 could intrude into that co-manager process in the future. That's all I had, but happy to answer any questions if other Council members have them.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:39] All right, thank you Kyle. Other discussion? David Sones.

David Sones [00:03:48] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to support what Kyle was saying for number 5. It's really confusing. I was having a hard time understanding what it means, but there's been a number of concerns raised from our tribal people and tribal entities that this could have an impact on how our co-management system works without us being able to review and understand how we fit into that. So I just wanted to support those comments by Kyle. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:21] Thank you. Vice-Chair Smith.

Butch Smith [00:04:23] Thank you Mr. Chair. I too support Kyle and Mr. Sones take on this. I value our co-manager relationships more than you know. We are to a point where we are working really close together and I would hate to move something forward that would muck that up. And so I am in the camp of, you know, because of our co-managed fisheries, up where we come from I am really not supportive fully because I, you know, would like to see where that comes in too also so. Anyway, I'll be supporting Kyle and Mr. Sones on this one.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:18] Thank you. Further discussion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:32] Excuse me. I'd like to speak to the two Sacramento items on the preliminary list. Thinking back to the Council's action when we directed the formation of the Sacramento Work Group following the literature review that was conducted on the Sac fall conservation objective through our methods review process maybe three years ago now, at that time I was under an impression that the new derivation that we'd be tasking the work group with would be some sort of actual estimate of suitable habitat, the carrying capacity of the Central Valley and its hatcheries to produce a sustainable standing stock biomass of Sacramento fall Chinook year over year. I expected that we'd get an analysis that accounted for modern day riparian habitat loss, reduced and human regulated freshwater flows, elevated temperatures, disease, reduced oxygen levels, contamination, invasives, saltwater intrusion, passage barriers, poaching, pollution, and predators. Clearly I was not on the right track with my thinking on how we would determine a conservation objective for Sac fall Chinook. So what I've done and what I'm learning to do now is in wondering how a conservationist objective is determined, I decided I would ask AI. And it told me that determining a salmon conservation objective is a complex process that involves integrating biological data, environmental factors, legal mandates, and social considerations. Resource managers, scientists, government agencies, and other stakeholders collaborate to establish benchmarks that aim to maintain healthy, diverse, and suitable salmon population. So while AI doesn't always get things right, what I do take from this answer is that it certainly would not be unprecedented to update the conservation objective in a process that's far more holistic than a methods review. I look at our SitSum and what the title of this agenda item suggests, it's a appropriately sterile sounding description for the process. It's a technical process intended to help clarify the technical basis for Pacific Council salmon management actions. So while I appreciate that we can use the methods review process to determine a new conservation objective, it doesn't mean that we should or that we must. I don't hear anyone trying to dispute that we can't do it in this process, but I think traditionally about the items we put on this list and this isn't a change to a base period or data input or new documentation or an update of an assumption in a model, this is a brand new method and never used and never tested that would be replacing an old derivation from the 1980's that we all agree can't be replicated. So with that, I feel like we're contemplating in this point in time putting a data-moderate groundfish stock assessment on a stock assessment priorities list without really understanding what best scientific information outcomes might result from it. Unfortunately California's learned the hard way with quillback and I have really gotten a lot out of thinking through the Informational Report 1 and the pathway that it offers us that allows a holistic review and development of a conservation objective along with the associated reference points through a comprehensive FMP review process. There's been a lot of concern with the number from the work group about the outcome of the derivation of hatchery and natural components that would be used to come up with a total conservation objective. And a reminder that we're undertaking review of the method and not the answer. It's tough to put the answer aside when thinking about that answer just really does not seem to make sense. A conservation objective in the neighborhood of 400,000 total adult Sac fall Chinook, which is what the, what my understanding is of what is recommended in the second alternative, the total conservation objective of hatchery plus natural. I just have to do a gut check on that, and it's really tough. And are those results representative of the Central Valley basin today versus

some former point in time or some future point in time that is seeming, at least to me, to be somewhat utopian? Thinking about that number of 400,000, that's a threefold increase over the current baseline that we have for our goal range of 122,000 to 180,000. That would make the minimum stock size threshold 300,000, or 75% of the SMSY. Looking at the last 15 years, every year would have been classified as overfished. The post-season realize estimates of the Sacramento Index are below that number 400,000 in 11 out of the last 15 years. And remember the Sacramento Index is the combined total of harvest from all sectors, ocean, inland, and the conservation objective. And so the idea that the fact that the new conservation objective would be higher than what we've seen for the total Sacramento Index in 11 out of 15 years is, just does not seem to match with today's conditions and realities. The info report does a great job describing the benefits of public engagement and transparency that would come from that pathway. And I know that this agenda item isn't where we take up consideration of how we might agendize development of an FMP amendment process, but I just want to note the multiple benefits of moving forward with the FMP amendment route and that that has been the recommendation that we have here today, both from our SAS and some of our public comments. I particularly want to acknowledge remarks from Kevin Godes and Marc about that we are in a new management regime already with Sacramento fall Chinook. We've employed the use of harvest guidelines. We've developed measures to implement a new biological opinion on Coastal Chinook that we really have yet to see how that is going to work in practice because we haven't had a commercial fishery off California in three years. So I am sensitive to the recommendation that let's slow down and see how the management that we've already implemented, how that plays out for us looking ahead. And I think the FMP amendment route gives us time to consider all of these reference points and the Harvest Control Rule holistically. Thinking back to our discussion in April that was something that really resonated, I think within the Council discussion that we need to do that and that isolating and approving reference points one at a time and being unable to see how they all fit together is not an ideal way to develop a management framework. So with that I just wanted to indicate that I prefer not to move forward with the Sacramento alternatives that are proposed. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:59] Thank you Marci. Let me check online. Susan Bishop, I don't want to put you on the spot, you did have your hand up. It's down if you're ready to speak, otherwise I'll just watch and we'll come back later.

Susan Bishop [00:16:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. I was going to....I'm happy to be last in line in my comments. You know many of the folks that have spoken before me have highlighted some of the points I was going to make, so it will make my thoughts or my comments probably more briefer, so if others have comments to put forward I'm happy to yield to them.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:37] All right, we'll move you down the list. And I will look around for any other hands here. John North.

John North [00:16:45] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, regarding this whole Sacramento fall Chinook Management Framework, I appreciate all the work the work group has done but I'm hearing more and more concerns and requests for greater clarity and transparency in the process regarding how and when the updates to the framework are implemented, pretty much similar to what the SAS Report spoke to. I'm hearing that externally too, like what's going on? So it seems to me we should have, we need a process or an opportunity for more public involvement given especially the complexity of this analyses and the potential ramifications of them, and that's hard to do when things are adopted independently. So I'd much prefer to make a decision after seeing the whole potential new management framework for Sacramento fall Chinook and so that you can see where it's headed. We have so many potential changes pending right now, I won't list them all but I think it might be best to defer implementation of further changes until we have all the alternatives together under a new potential framework. So I support the FMP process because I think it allows for a lot of these things. It slows it down, we get more

transparency, more chance for engagement. And some of the modifications would require an FMP process anyway and the FMP uses best scientific information throughout so I think it checks all the boxes. I really did appreciate the Council staff putting together that Informational Report 1 which it gives us several pathways we can take moving forward and I found that report to be really useful, especially that decision flow chart in Table 1, which leads me kind of down path 1B and eventually added to path 2. And so anyway with all that I do have a motion on the potential method review, methodology review topics whenever that's appropriate so....

Pete Hassemer [00:19:27] All right, thank you John. I appreciate your offer of a motion there. Let me check back first to Susan Bishop who did want to speak and then I'll look around. It looks like there's some others but we'll hold that spot available so. And Susan before that I think we had a hand over here, Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:19:55] Thanks Chair. I guess I feel differently because I do support review of both the Sacramento topics. This is difficult because I feel like this is a pretty clear difference between science and policy. This is a methodology review which is designed to look at methods and science and hold us to the Best Scientific Information Available and use the best science that we can from all scientific disciplines to make the best decisions that we can. I don't think it is in the National Standards to not look at science because we don't like what the potential outcome might be. It is to look at that science and then make management decisions based on that. This potential review I still struggle with how this is related to the need to update and change the larger management framework. I agree that that larger management framework does need to be reviewed. It needs to be changed but I don't see this as connected. People keep using the word "holistic", and I confess that I'm still confused about what that actually means or how that applies to the potential methods that have been put before us and how that relates to some sort of holistic review of the management framework. And I just have major concerns that this is violating National Standard 2 and that this is really not trusting our scientists and moving forward in a good faith effort to manage with the best science that we have. I heard the SAS, and thank you Mr. Godes for providing public testimony, I appreciate that and I hear your concerns and I know why you're concerned. I feel that in this particular decision when we're talking about methods review that that's unfortunately not germane to the decision that we have in front of us. I think in general it is important to take the recommendations of the SSC where we can. We certainly are not required to do that, that's clear. But I think when the SSC comes to us, especially when they've come to us multiple times with the same recommendation and saying we think this might be useful to you, I think it's really important to listen to that. Also I want to note, I think this was noted by someone else, that we have the option not to implement the methods that necessarily come out of this as shown by last year. The cohort reconstruction that the Council selected for last year was not used for management this year. I just want to note I am largely supportive of Informational Report Number 1 regarding moving forward on the updates to the FMP generally. Again I think that is also needed. And finally I'm just going to note that this is difficult because it makes me very concerned and generally about how we're approaching salmon generally when we are talking about data and methods from the 1980's. When we are so wrapped around the axle that we are struggling to pick apart the difference between science and management and understanding where those two things nexus and struggling to get through that process. And ultimately this is nested within a much larger, even more painful reality of the status of water in the state of California, but we still have to do what we can and do what we are tasked to do. So I just reiterate again I am supportive of moving forward with both of the Sacramento review topics and would like to see those come forward. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:07] Thank you Corey. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:24:11] Thank you Chair Hassemer. Admittedly I do not come from salmon land and I do typically reside in groundfish world, however going over these documents I was kind of having

some flashbacks to quillback and that kind of the corner that we were backed into, and I say the royal we, we're backed into when things started moving, and interestingly enough I've been talking to stakeholders in Northern California, salmon stakeholders, they've created a new word. They said they feel like they're about to get quillbacked. And I kind of laughed and yet, and then I had to stop because that is how scary this is to them through the lens that they're seeing it, what could happen, where this could go if it moves on. And so while I don't have any technical comment towards this, I just from the stakeholder standpoint and from someone kind of on the out, looking into this with kind of a fresh lens it was concerning just seeing how this was happening. The work group is, I'm sure has done great work, but the comments that I had seen and heard about it's kind of happening in a bit of a black box and a lack of transparency when it comes to setting these goals once this gets put in place or gets approved, I apologize. So I just, I feel like I need to put that out there from the stakeholder standpoint. I think moving this forward is highly concerning and yeah, I just needed to flag that. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:20] Thank you Jaime. Susan Bishop did you want to speak to this?

Susan Bishop [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Chair. I have a little bit to say on a couple of the topics. I'll start with the Topic 5 that was proposed by the SSC. I still find that the description of that particular topic for methodology review extremely unclear and confusing. And I appreciate Dr. Schaffler's attempts to answer my questions and to provide those, that clarity, but I find it still very unclear and confusing. At times narrow in scope and at other times broad in scope, and with potential implications to both policy decisions and the implications to the co-management process in the North Falcon area. So I really feel strongly and it feels strongly that in order for this topic to move forward it would need much more clarity and so maybe consideration at a future date. So we would not be support.....we will not support moving that particular methodology topic forward. With regard to the Oregon, the OPIH and the OCN matrix topics, NMFS doesn't have a strong feeling on these. It sounds like the OCN topic probably would trigger a methodology review if the Council decides we are supportive of moving them forward, but acknowledging the workload considerations that several folks have outlined today we're not looking for extra work and so if the topics do not align with the requirement for methodology review we think that's where a place where savings could be held and give folks that are overworked now a rest and more time to spend maybe on higher priority issues. Finally with regard to Sacramento River fall Chinook, we appreciate the work of the work group on the topic and the progress that has been made on methodologies for estimating SMSY and the conservation objective for Sacramento fall Chinook and bringing that to the Council. The work is very challenging. It's important to the resource and to the fishery as evidenced by the amount of work that Dr. Satterthwaite in particular and the work group have done, but also the level of interest by industry and public that we have heard over the last year. The science that's been done lays a good foundation for further work on the management framework and in the FMP for this stock. I'm not hearing anyone suggesting that we set the science aside or that the two different pathways that we're talking about would result in something less than best available science in the ultimate implementation. Ms. Ridings had said that she doesn't understand, and maybe I misunderstood her, how these two topics relate to the overall harvest matrix for Sacramento falls. They're integral to that. They will ultimately define what the shape of the Harvest Control Rule is, and so they aren't separate from that. All of those pieces together will show what the trade-offs are between the fishery and the resource, something else that the work group was tasked with. And so the framework, the management framework for Sacramento falls relies on multiple components to provide the information to manage the fishery and to sustain the resource and ensure that the fishery is sustainable. And so it's important that those components fit together well and smoothly and we have the ability to adapt them or to change, revise them, to do that if in putting them all together it's found that there are disconnects. The work group was tasked with developing improvements to these components as well as the analysis of biological risks and fishery related benefits and so just all of this.....(audio drop).....and we don't have all those pieces in place to ultimately help with that. We hear the interests of the Council, the industry, and the public in an approach that allows consideration of a

full framework and better understanding of the effects on the stock and the fishery before any final decision is made. The ability to make subsequent adjustments to the framework when considering all of the components together could be precluded or at least made much more difficult if only evaluating one component at a time. I would also say that the trust in the science and the trust in the decisions that we make is incredibly important in our being able to effectively implement the policies that we decide on in the Council. And if anything else, I would say the last three to five years have been huge examples of just exactly that. If the public and the industry understand the science and they understand the basis behind what they are being asked to sacrifice or to take advantage of, they will support us as we go forward. The industry itself in the first two, in the first closure strongly supported that on its own even without NMFS's additional guidance at the time. The important part was that they understood why that needed to happen and that the science was solid and they helped us in implementing those frameworks. So at least from NMFS's perspective we think that the public's involvement and transparency is very important to the decisions and the support for the decisions that the Council makes and ultimately NMFS approves and adopts. Therefore NMFS supports an approach that considers the management framework in the FMP holistically something along the lines of what has been proposed in the Roadmap, rather than addressing a portion of that framework one at a time through the methodology review process solely. And as you've heard several folks mention, we believe that the process allows for a different process than the management methodology review solely and the Roadmap also lays out that basis. The methodology review is done on a short timeline and with relatively limited opportunity for Council engagement as you have heard expressed today. So we support moving the topic forward as part of a consideration of the FMP amendment, which would allow both for development of the scientific information and adjustments to the management framework in response to that information if it's needed, as well as important input from industry and the public. In saying that I want to underscore again the point I made and also the importance that Ms. Riding underscored, that science must continue to be the foundation of this work and that the work group would be an important participant in the work moving forward. And that concludes my remarks on this topic.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:15] Thank you Susan. Had quite a bit of discussion. There was an offer of a motion. We took up some more discussion after that but I want to turn back to John because there, again there will be opportunity for a discussion there if you feel you're ready.

John North [00:07:35] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I could read that motion if I can see it. I move to advance the following methodology review topics for final topic selection. Number 1 is the Oregon Production Index Hatchery, or OPIH forecast methodology, including the index exponential-decay-weighting approach adopted for use in 2025 as described in Agenda Item F.1.a Situation Summary. And Number 2, proposed changes to the Oregon Coast Natural Coho Marine Survival Index as described in agenda item F.1.a, Supplemental ODFW Report 1, ODFW letter to Chair Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:28] Thank you John. I followed along. The language on the screen looks accurate and complete, is that right?

John North [00:08:34] It does.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:35] All right, is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

John North [00:08:41] Thank you. I don't have a lot. Just in terms of the items in this motion, I included those here today because I think they're fairly simple and ready for review. The Oregon Production Index, or OPIH forecast methodology, which includes that new exponential-decay-weighting approach was what we adopted last year for use in 2025, or sorry not last year, earlier this year and appears to be the best forecast methodology available currently based on the hindcasting work that's been done. It

was mentioned that staff, a lot of the staff associated with the work on this are quite busy with U.S. v. Oregon related tasks and so we we didn't include, you know, side projects on this like splitting it out into early's and late's, it's just a review of the standard methodology. And then on Number 2, that relates to the proposed changes to the Oregon Coast Natural Marine Survival Index. That's unfortunately a topic we had to put on here but it's needed and we think we've already identified a reasonable solution so I put those on there. I did not include other topics in this motion today for final methodology review based on what I was hearing from testimony and other Council members, which was basically lots of uncertainty and discomfort with moving those other items forward. So this motion is just an attempt to reflect our discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:23] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Take my time. I see no questions for clarification. Discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion on the motion then I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:10:51] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:53] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you John. I want to go.....let's go back to Angela and go through the Council tasks there. Angela is there more we should take up? How are we doing?

Angela Forristall [00:11:28] Thank you Mr. Chair. The Council has completed their work under this agenda in that they have adopted two items for methodology review. That review will take place on October 9th and 10th, most likely given the number of topics only October 9th. There's also been a lot of discussion under this agenda item about the Sacramento River Work Groups topics, whether or not those should be addressed under the methodology review. The motion just passed by the Council indicated they are not wishing to put them through methodology review this year, but potentially shifting them to an FMP amendment process which the Council would further discuss under workload planning. I do want to just provide the Council with a little extra information. The work group is providing an update at the November Council meeting as well and they have been working on a draft report based on the guidance provided at that meeting, at the previous update given to the Council last year. When the work group does meet again in October they can kind of take the conversations that they've heard here today from the Council in finalizing the draft report that they have been working on but that there is no anticipation that the Council is going to be providing the work group with any specific guidance at this meeting recognizing that the Council has also voiced that the science and efforts done by the work group so far have been valuable and will continue to be so moving forward when they're looking at updates to this management framework. So I'm hoping that potentially kind of ties up the conversations that have happened not directly related to the methodology review topics and my understanding about how we'll move forward with the rest of the week.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:43] Thank you Angela. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:13:48] Thanks Mr. Chair. Sorry if I didn't get my hand up fast enough. Sorry Angela. I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:57] All right, go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:14:01] All right. And I will also apologize to the tower of power I'm just going to talk this one in. I move that Methodology Review Topics 1 and 2 and Supplemental SSC Report 1 are moved forward for review at the October 2025 Salmon Methodology Review. And that looks really close, just after "review" write the word, "topics". And I think I may have spoken I'm going to do a little copy editing on the fly. I think we can say I move that methodology and we can take out the, "the".

Pete Hassemer [00:15:35] Sorry I needed to have a discussion there. Is what is on the screen accurate and complete?

Corey Ridings [00:15:43] It is. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:45] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Christa Svensson. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:15:58] Thanks Mr. Chair. I think I covered most of this earlier so I'll keep this short. I just think that these review topics are important for the Council meeting its best scientific information available goals. I think that the SSC has reviewed the topics that were provided and suggested to us by the work group as we asked them to do. And I think that this is a good opportunity to look at our methods, make them as sound as possible, and then review them for management down the line. And I think I'll stop there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:41] Thank you. Questions for clarification on the motion? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:16:45] Thank you Mr. Chair. I believe the methods review meeting that we just approved the two topics for is October 9th if I understood correctly, though we have a November Council meeting agenda item that would be to consider the results of that methods review meeting in October. So I'm hoping you can clarify which meeting your proposing topics be reviewed? Thank you.

Corey Ridings [00:17:27] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Yaremko, that was my mistake. I meant to say October there if I misspoke. It's probably my bad eye.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:53] Excuse me, that was a technical clarification to your.....

Corey Ridings [00:17:57] It was. I'm sorry about that.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:58] Okay, so that should read then as we went through this November 2025 not, they had typed the change in but removed it. Should it be October or November?

Corey Ridings [00:18:13] It should be October. I'm sorry about that, yeah.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:26] All right. Thank you for that technical correction then. Other questions for clarification? Not seeing any hands then, discussion on the motion? I've learned to look very carefully here. Not seeing any hands then I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Corey Ridings [00:19:00] Aye.

Rebecca Lent [00:19:00] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:00] We had a "Aye" vote from Corey Ridings and Rebecca Lent. Is that correct? Opposed.

Council [00:19:08] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:12] Abstentions?

Sharon Kiefer [00:19:14] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:17] And Christa Svensson abstained?

Christa Svensson [00:19:20] Thank you Mr. Chair. I was in favor, which is of discussing the topic which is why I seconded it, but I did in fact vote no.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:31] Oh I'm sorry, I'm trying to figure out in my ears here who abstained? Sharon Kiefer? All right, thank you. So all the votes are in. Mr. Executive Director you're tallying, but I think we have two yeas and one abstention, and I don't have the number of.....the motion failed. Thank you.

Christa Svensson [00:20:04] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. This is a point of order, but I voted in opposition, not in favor as is stated on the record. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:18] Okay the motion fails as indicated there. Further action on this discussion? I think, as Angela had indicated, we've completed our tasks but Susan Bishop is that your hand?

Susan Bishop [00:20:50] Yes it is Mr. Chair. I don't have further action, but I do have a comment and observation to make I guess, if that's okay with you.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:59] Please go ahead.

Susan Bishop [00:21:02] I meant to do this at public comment, but I would just like to acknowledge that this is the first salmon, first Council meeting salmon agenda item without Joel Kawahara's comments during public comment. As you know he was a regular commenter on what we did. He had clear opinions. He also usually never brought a concern without a ready solution. And his voice, at least on the salmon, I will miss his voice on the salmon items and his Council. So I just wanted to speak to that.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:40] Thank you Susan. Angela, I'm going to turn to you again before I look around the table for any closing comments. But I think we're getting close to completing our work. Anything else to do?

Angela Forristall [00:21:57] No Mr. Chair, nothing else to do. Happy to address any questions about what I might have stated earlier, but other than that your actions under this agenda item are complete.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:12] All right. Any other discussion to be had on this? Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:22:21] Thank you. I'll just reiterate something that Angela spoke to a minute ago. This was a very robust discussion and per usual practice. Kelly and I are making notes about the things that it looks like this Council wants to work on in the future. So we'll be modifying the Year-At-A-Glance summary and bringing that back to you later in this meeting. What I heard from you all is that you're interested in seeing a schedule for an FMP amendment. So we'll have that day last and we can discuss the Sac fall issue again at that time. So I just want to provide that clarity.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:01] All right, With that I think we've completed our business on this agenda item so we'll close it out.

G. Groundfish Management

1. National Marine Fisheries Service Report

Butch Smith [00:00:00] I have no public comment on my screen so, and there is no public comment by the back, Christmas tree back there, so we'll go into Council discussion. Any discussion on this issue? Miss Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:00:17] Thank you. I just want to highlight how many of the sampling and survey projects rely on industry in a pretty substantial way, whether it's fisheries independent or fisheries dependent data. And as I mentioned, those of us that are on the water daily typically are the first to really notice significant change and flag it one way or the other. And I know when we get later on into another item with methodology review, we talk about using more....how to deal with fishery dependent data, and I just want to highlight the importance of it to what the work that we do. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:01:02] No, thank you and your team down there and people who participate, that's very important to our fisheries. Anyone else? Chairman Hassemer.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:15] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Not any question or discussion. I think a lot of us in the hallways have commented to the Science Center and those involved in the presentations on Saturday, but maybe a little more formal here under this agenda item, that was really well received. Your staffs and everyone put a lot of effort into it, an incredible exchange of information and exploration of some of the questions that went into the stock assessments, an opportunity for people to think about that question and talk about it and get some understanding. So really I think there was a lot value in that. A lot of people appreciated that, so thanks for those efforts.

Butch Smith [00:02:06] Thank you Chairman Hassemer. Anyone else? All right, Todd have we completed our duties here on this subject?

Todd Phillips [00:02:20] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. You have heard both from the Region and the Science Center and had your public comment, or excuse me, your comment from the GAP, and you've had some discussion here with questions and answers. So yes I would agree that you have completed your action.

Butch Smith [00:02:35] Thank you.

2. Phase 2 Stock Definitions-Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] We're going to start the day coming back to part 2 of Agenda Item G.2, our Phase 2 Stock Definitions. I will turn it over to Katrina just for some, a little bit of recap, refresh our minds on what we're doing here. Katrina.

Katrina Bernaus [00:00:18] Thank you Mr. Chair. We are back to Agenda Item G.2, Phase 2 Stock Definitions. Under this action the Council is expected to adopt a Final Preferred Alternative for 42 species and adopt an FMP amendment as appropriate and provide guidance as appropriate on next steps. Yesterday the Council heard an overview from Council staff on this action as well as a briefing from General Counsel. Reports from ODFW, CDFW, and WDFW. Reports from the SSC, the GAP, and the GMT, and from public comment. Today the Council will have Council discussion and then take final action. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:10] All right, thank you. With that I will open the floor whether you have questions. We did not get into any discussion yesterday. Now is the time for that so where's a hand to start our process here? Everybody's still thinking. Am I missing any hands? Lynn Mattes. Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:01:50] Thank you Chair. I was just waiting for the correct document to open up on my computer with my notes. We are trying to take final action under this agenda item. We, the royal we, the Council family, Council staff, GMT, GAP, and here on the Council floor we've spent a lot of time and effort on this item. At times it has been very frustrating because in some ways it seems that the outcome was predetermined, what would happen. So then a question of why have we been spending so much time and effort if it was already predetermined? Over the course of this week there have been a lot of discussions between the state agency staff, Miss Kent, Miss Quan to help work through some of those concerns and some of those issues. I don't think we've gotten 100% where we need to go, but we've gotten 90 to 95% on a lot things. You know this is tough separating things out of the FMP when we have been managing a certain way. We've been managing collaboratively for decades. So much of our management, our sampling, our data analysis, everything is interrelated. We, as I said in the ODFW Report, our samplers don't go up to a boat and oh that's a federal fish or oh that's state fish, we sample it all. We're covered under a variety of funding sources. So going into this, taking some things out of the FMP so they'd be under state management or EC species and leaving some in, it's new for all of us. It's different than what we've been used to doing and it's going to require a change in how we do things, how we approach things. I do appreciate all the communication and coordination like I said. Last...supper last night was the first meal since I got here I had where I wasn't in a meeting talking about stock definitions. I personally spent about a month's worth of my work time preparing for the June Council meeting on stock definitions alone. I've spent about three weeks preparing for this meeting and that's three weeks of eight hours a day, five days a week. The amount of sleep I have lost over this agenda item I don't even want to do that math, that would make me very, very sad. So it is a complicated issue and there's a lot of thought and a lot of effort and a lot work that's going into it. It is a bit of a struggle because it does seem to be inadvertently putting us versus them, state versus federal in some cases. And I do think it also has the potential to create some state versus state issues that we're doing our best to try to work out and avoid. We've had a lot of conversations with WDFW and CDFW all along. Change is hard and also concerned about the downstream effects. You know a lot of our funding for sampling programs is tied to federal grants through RECfin and PACfin among other things, so if we remove some key species key to our fisheries, will that affect our funding down the line? Will it affect our data collection? I had....just yesterday, based on discussions that we started yesterday, I had one of our port biologists reach out through some other staff to me to say, okay, I've got stripetail. What do I do? Do I continue to sample it or not? The answer is yes, please continue to sample as you would be. But there are a lot of downstream implications that we're trying to work out. So through a lot this

conversation and work, like I said, I think we have a path forward on 90-95% of the species and the work we have. There's some stuff that we haven't been able to come together on that we may have to punt down the road a little bit, but there's some commitment, I think, from all of the agency staff to continue on that work. I have a plethora of motions when it does come that time, but I just thought this could get us started.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:06] All right, thank you. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:06:10] Thank you Miss Mattes for getting us all started this morning. I appreciate your comments and I want to say too from the NMFS perspective we appreciate the opportunity to continue discussion. We've had a lot of good discussions leading up to this meeting, but really over the last year in particular on this issue. It is hard. This is a challenging one and what I appreciate is the continued commitment to talking through the hard things. And what I have been optimistic about are about the relationships around this table. They are important and they are valuable and we will continue to foster them, and that is helpful when we have hard discussions. And I keep leaning back on that is that we have done a lot of great work and we have lots of great to keep doing forever there. I don't feel we'll ever be done on groundfish. There will always be something to fix. And so I do want to recognize that it is hard to come into those spaces where we don't agree on everything, but the willingness to come to the table is what I have seen and I appreciate and want to recognize there is a lot of good collaboration and coordination and we want to continue that, so I appreciate the opportunity to keep talking and we're here and we will be here, and so I just want to recognize that and agree with those points that Miss Mattes raised.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:47] Thank you. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:07:52] Thank you Chair Hassemer, and good morning everyone. I just want to also weigh-in here and echo the appreciation for the discussions we've been having over time, but in particular the ones we've had at this meeting. We really thought that the idea of change is hard but the idea and the approach to change should be informed by as much information as possible and that includes this interrelatedness and the connectivity between how we collect data and manage fisheries in coordination between jurisdictions, and that's really, we speak to that in the WDFW Report under this agenda item and have requested that we have a conversation about how changes are affected in this broader context, and so I just want to offer the appreciation for those conversations and the opportunity for them to continue as we work through this. Yeah, thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:16] Thank you. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:09:18] Thank you. I realized in recognizing our conversations with the states and the tribes, which have been very important along the way, I also want to recognize that the conversations that have happened in the GAP and in the GMT and in SSC, now multiple meetings on this agenda item they have been very tough and I've listened to those conversations, right, each groups focus on the different aspects of this. There's a lot in play and I recognize that, you know, within each of those groups they've had challenging conversations and I appreciate that what I have seen in this arena is the willingness to keep talking through difficult things and so that's happened at all levels and I don't want to miss those folks that have also worked really hard on this and the stakeholders that have come forward to share their concerns with us and have an opportunity to dialogue on that, that's what has been really helpful in thinking through sort of where we're going next.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:19] Thank you. Any other discussion here? And if I don't see any hands then I'm going to turn back to Lynn because motions always stimulate discussion so let's start there.

Lynn Mattes [00:10:38] All righty, thank you Chair Hassemer. And I've been communicating with Kris here this morning and I think he's got things ready. I have broken this out as I talked about back in June, how do you eat an elephant? Take one bite at a time. So to try to be careful in how we're eating the elephant, to again abuse that metaphor, I do have it broken down into multiple motions to try to be bite size chunks, things that fit together. So if we could have ODFW Motion 1 please. It helps if I can read these. So I move the Council adopt as the Final Preferred Alternative, FPA, Alternative 1, identifying the following species as a need of conservation and management in the Exclusive Economic Zone and should remain in the groundfish FMP: Black rockfish off of Washington. Rosethorn rockfish, coastwide. Quillback rockfish off of Washington. And stripetail rockfish, coastwide.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:50] All right. What's on the screen is accurate and complete? And I just want to highlight also in addition to staying, being part of Alternative 1 it is also Option 1 as indicated there.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:08] Option 1. Yes sir. Thank you for that clarification.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:10] All right. So what's there is accurate and complete then.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:14] Yes sir, it is.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:14] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Heather Hall. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:19] Thank you Chair. You know stripetail and rosethorn in June were requested to have additional 10-factor analysis. Council staff, I think Katrina and Todd worked on that, provided some new information. The SSC recommended they be coastwide. The GAP suggested they could be EC species. The GMT suggested they should be....stay within the FMP. And just given some recent increase in catches and some uncertainty as to what's causing that it seemed appropriate to keep those within the FMP. Black rockfish and quillback off Washington, those were sort of left hanging last in June. The 10-factor analysis indicates that those species are predominantly caught in federal waters and therefore would qualify to stay within the FMP. And I think that covers that.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:19] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? No questions, discussion on the motion? Seeing no hands for discussion I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:13:36] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:40] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:48] Okay, thank you sir. If the tower of power could, when they get ready, Motion 2. I move the Council adopt as FPA Alternative 2, identifying the following species as not in need of conservation and management in the EEZ and should be removed from the groundfish FMP: Black and yellow rockfish. Black rockfish off California. Blue rockfish off California. Brown rockfish. Cabezon rockfish, the Oregon and California portions, their cabezon. Calico rockfish. Chameleon rockfish. China rockfish off California only. Copper rockfish California only. Dwarf red rockfish. Freckled rockfish. Gopher rockfish. Grass rockfish. Half-banded rockfish. Harlequin, and honeycomb rockfish. Kelp greenling off of Oregon and California. Kelp rockfish. Leopard shark. Light dusky rockfish. Olive, pink, pinkrose, pygmy rockfish. Quillback rockfish California only. Swordspine rockfish, and a tree fish.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:11] Thank you. That language on the screen appears accurate and complete?

Lynn Mattes [00:15:18] Yes sir, it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:19] Thank you. Is there a second to that motion? Seconded by Caroline McKnight. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:15:26] Thank you sir. This adopts.....most of these were species that were identified in the PPA. Most of these are species that have de minimus catch, or there is very little catch in federal waters. Example, light dusky rockfish, I think there's one recording of one fish landed 20 years ago and therefore it was in the FMP. So a lot of these are species that don't occur in federal waters or may have been a one-off, you know like just may have a been a on-off and got in the FMP. There are some additions. The main additions are China rockfish and quillback rockfish off of California. Those species through the 10-factor analysis do not meet the predominance in federal waters. And as there was discussion yesterday, CDFW already has a Nearshore Management Plan process in place to manage those through their state processes. Sorry, that was the end of my thoughts on that one.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:41] All right, let me look around. Any questions for clarification on the motion? No questions. Discussion on the motion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:16:55] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you Miss Mattes for the motion here. I just want to echo a few of the comments that I heard around the table relative to these decisions today and this motion being hard and change is hard. I think both are true, and there's a lot of intricacies here and there is a lot details. But as outlined in the CDF&W Report, I do think that we are prepared not only with the current infrastructure of regulations that we have in place for both our recreational and our commercial fishery, but we are prepared to start taking additional steps to ensure that these stocks are sustainably managed and covered in any way that might be needed. So thank you for the motion. I'll be supporting it.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:41] Thank you. Further discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:17:47] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Mattes for the motion. I will not be voting for this motion, although I appreciate all the work that went into it by you and I'm guessing a lot of other people. We heard some thoughts this morning about how much effort this agenda item has taken by a very large number of people across all of the states and the federal governments and the tribes so I don't want that to go remiss, but I appreciate all of that effort from folks that have gone into this. From the beginning of this I have had a lot of heartburn about considering the removal of species, especially a large number of species from active management, and that is because fundamentally about the scope of what we do and the interconnectedness of our FMP and the species that are in that FMP. And while I think we've had a short conversation this morning that change is scary and change is hard, change can also be necessary, but it also shouldn't be rushed and I think it should be well thought out. And I think that while this Council has a reputation for being very slow, this Council also has a reputation for being very deliberative and being very inclusive of public comment and being inclusive in that way, and so I don't think that the way this agenda item has gone down has held us to that standard. I think I'm just going to say a few more things here about this. You know, as I've been thinking about this agenda item and preparing for the meeting, you know I am not a lawyer so it's difficult to go into the legal minutiae, but I have been listening and I appreciate what NMFS has provided us in terms of their legal rationale and their thinking, basically since I think it's been two years about why this needed to happen and why this came forward in the first place in response to quillback. I very much respect NMFS's GC and the analysis and opinions that they have provided us. Respectfully, I do think that when it comes to jurisdiction and fish and species and stocks being in state versus federal waters, it's my understanding that the MSA provides a lot of flexibility with this and I disagree with the position that stocks must be removed from the FMP based on predominance. Our history of management here on the West Coast,

granted it's very complex, it's a system of management. The fed, state's, tribes and the capacity and interest in species and fisheries as the environment changes and the fishery changes waxes and wanes between entities, jurisdictions can change. So the MSA, in my mind, doesn't force jurisdiction in state waters, but it allows and encourages it. So it's a matter of I'm not disagreeing and my interpretation is that absolutely states do have the ability to manage, and in fact they do. But the MSA also provides that ability for the Council and a federal FMP if the states would like to cooperate and want to conform it can be done in state waters, which is what this FMP has been doing for decades. Given that, I'll call that a wider legal interpretation or an interpretation of the MSA that there can be that management in state waters, or the ability of the feds to collaborate with the states, that the EA is actually incomplete and doesn't explore the full range of alternatives for all species, it only explores the alternatives that are in the PPA. And I understand why it was written that way because that's what the Council told the staff to do. That was what was in our PPA. So given this open interpretation that these stocks may be managed by the Council and may be done under the groundfish FMP, that opens up a lot more considerations in terms of how we approach this item as a Council and how we're thinking about these items. So I looked at the purpose and need again because I think that's always helpful as a member to try to route where you're coming from and get back to what we're actually trying to do here. What's the problem we're trying to solve? And how did we initially conceptualize how we got down this road? And it's my reading and my interpretation that the agenda item does not include Alternative 2, which is removal from the FMP, because the purpose and need said identify and define TBD stocks of TBD managed groundfish species in need of conservation and management at a geographic scale sufficient for assessing overfished status and determining if overfishing is occurring in alignment with National Standard 1. So this would very likely preclude management by state entities that do not have the capacity to assess overfished status, determine if overfishing, and determining if overfishing is occurring. The EA did not analyze this, but it is apparent from Council floor discussion and advisory body reports that those are reasonably in question. So if we move beyond predominance into a wider discussion about some of the issues raised by state reports and by advisory bodies in this meeting and at previous Council meetings, if the Council, going back to purpose and need, wanted to examine reorganization of its FMP to better align with geographic scale and existing biological, ecological, social, and economic conditions, then it should take a wider, more comprehensive approach that considers more information and provides more potential options. So I went through our reports, and this could include a National Standard 3 analysis that includes a review of the uncertainty around species and stock structure and the impacts of differential geographic management, a fuller exploration of the 10 factors for each species, a briefing paper that describes the fishery dependent and fishery independent data collection programs, an exploration of the current state, federal, tribal cooperation that has been occurring with a further exploration of avenues for conflict resolution among resource users. An analysis of what options are most cost effective and efficient, including what the cost of changing existing management to between state, tribes, and NMFS. I personally would like to see a redesign and think about our stock complexes and how those are being used. Similarly, our design and use of EC species designations. We heard about the ability to respond to changing conditions and fishery dynamics as well as to adjust, the ability to adjust our geographic scales of management as changes happen. I don't think we have fully explored the impacts of these changes on treaty tribal obligations. And we talked about this this morning in delegation a bit in California, but before any changes are made, that there are plans developed for any handoffs that would happen between various government entities. Beyond the legal issues that we have been brought forward, and this is not to minimize them again, they were brought forward with reason and I respect NMFS's positions on this, I still think this is a major departure from the way the Council has done business. Finally, moving beyond the legal, the FMP, the Council versus state, at the end of the day the fish don't care about government lines. Fishermen don't care about government lines. The larger ecosystem doesn't care about government lines. People want to fish and people want to enjoy a healthy ocean and people want to know that this will be available to the next generation. So moving from one decisional platform, in this case, the Council and the groundfish FMPs, to four or even more decisional platforms isn't making a lot of practical sense to me. While imperfect, the federal groundfish

FMP does provide a platform for collaboration between government entities, provides the ability to consider actions across the ecosystem and across species, and provides the opportunity for the public to provide input and work with each other. So that was a little bit lengthy, but I wanted to put that out there and share that this has been difficult, I think, for a lot of people, but I continue to be extremely concerned about the scope and impact of what removing species from the FMP will have on the water for fishermen, for our fish, for the ecosystem. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:14] Thank you Corey. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:27:17] Thank you Ms. Ridings for your points to the Council. A couple pieces that I want to pick up and go back on. One, I think the history of this, right, and this is a nuanced point, we have been working on this for three and a half years, right, so and I did, I went back and I looked at March 2022 when we brought this to the Council how we teed this up. And it is very clearly teed up when we started this that we expected that the Council was going to look at whether these are stocks that are in need of conservation and management in the EEZ in particular because of this history with nearshore stocks. So it was teed up that that was an explicit part of this as well as reconsideration of EC species, and so it's been a long road. I certainly respect your opinion on whether you feel like that is too fast or not. Couple of the pieces, one on jurisdiction, right? The law is really clear and I can see from a biologist's perspective that it feels unsatisfactory, but I think as we all know around this table we are bound within the confines of the law, and this is a point that we have to keep ourselves within. I think of it similarly as, right, we can't just go fish in Canadian EEZ waters, right, like that there's structure in there. And in the same way, I don't disagree the fish don't care, and yet still our only ability is to make decisions within the governance structure and the authority and jurisdiction that we have. I will acknowledge it feels unsatisfactory, but still that's the hard part of what we have to decide. I want to touch on your NEPA point real quick because we had that good discussion in June, and I think I hinted in June that I thought you would be unsatisfied with the NEPA document, right? Because I could see what you were looking for. You know, on the NEPA part of things, right, we're not required to impact, to analyze impacts outside of our jurisdiction. We don't have the ability to control what happens in state waters so it doesn't make sense to build a NEPA document looking at that piece of it. I appreciate that the states have separately brought us that information and that feels much more appropriate to me than designing a NEPA document that covers impacts that this Council can't do anything about in state waters. There is a recent Supreme Court case on that particular issue, and again, I don't know that it benefits to get us into those particular aspects, but we did look hard at that question, right? Every time we're looking at how to analyze a particular situation we're look at what do we need to do? What is appropriate? And this was, I think, a known issue. So I want to be clear that it was careful and deliberate decision of how to structure that, but we went into it knowing that there would be certain folks that felt like that didn't get at what they want, but that doesn't mean that this NEPA document isn't sufficient. There's a lot of things at play here and I know it's challenging and a lot them we have talked about and we had a lot a good discussion in June on this as well, and so I appreciate you reiterating your perspective on it. And I think, right, there are some things that we can agree on and there's some things that we respectfully disagree on, and I think that's been clear, right? Hopefully there's.....I don't see anything here in this discussion or in this action today that hasn't been fully transparent and out there. And so hopefully that's helpful as well is that I haven't seen any surprises both from what I've heard from you and hopefully what you've heard from me as we've gone through this process.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:21] Thank you. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:00:00] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Kent for that. I appreciate those comments and I agree with you. I think this is very respectful and I'm very grateful for NMFS for having open dialogue and I couldn't help but laugh when you were like, this has actually been three and a half years. Council time can be funny. I was just going to briefly respond to that. Agreeing to respectfully disagree about

interpretation of MSA's ability and how that plays out and I think that is just what that is, something that is open to interpretation. And regarding the NEPA documents, similarly, I think that it's important that we have that full range. I think if the legal interpretation had been more open to go both directions in terms of encompassing the status quo management where even though the states are legally managing those fish, that there is the relationship here at the Council and the federal FMP and how that conformance is happening, and so in my view the NEPA document should have included that so that the Council could have made a more overarching decision about what was best for the fishery and the fish. Again, that is just an opinion and I'm grateful for the dialogue and the respectful disagreement.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:32] Further discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:01:38] Thank you Chair Hassemer and thank you for this conversation. I just want to acknowledge that I appreciate many of the points made by Miss Ridings that you're bringing up here. I also want to call out that really we see a lot of species that are not caught in Washington under here, and in this case I think we recognize this is really CDFW's choice and are looking to them for how action ends up on this. So just wanted to flag that. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:19] Thank you. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:02:21] Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you all the folks for bringing in these points this morning. My understanding is that we'll be back to talk about this at the Council as we start looking at, continue our work on groundfish. We won't be ignoring what's going on in the states, that'll come back on the table. We'll have maybe even some criteria to consider for changing this decision I assume if we can have criteria for taking species out of the FMP then we can take another look at it for putting them back in as needed. Nothing is constant in fishing except for change. So I hope by supporting these changes we're not ruling out the possibility of reversing that later on. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:12] Thank you. Vice-Chair Smith.

Butch Smith [00:03:15] Yeah Miss Riding and very thoughtful thoughts that you had. There's just one little thing that you said that kind of as a fisherman kind of poked my ears up. There are lines all out over the ocean that the fishermen have to care about or Mr. German comes and gets us or NOAA comes and get us, and so I don't think you meant it quite the way I heard it, but I just want for the record, I want to say that fishermen have to contend with all kinds of lines and it's very important that we stay on the right side of the line and we do what we have to do to maintain our livelihood. And like I said, I'm sure you didn't mean it that way but I just wanted to clarify on that. So thank you, thank you Mrs. Riding.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:12] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:04:13] Thanks Chair. Thanks Vice. You're absolutely right. That is not how I meant it. It is in the spirit of fishermen just want fish and that you go to the ocean and you don't see lines. Of course, you know when you're looking at your screens you do see lines, but we want to provide that ability. People aren't thinking necessarily of the deep pile of regulations that exists in our federal government and our state government when they wake up in the morning and decide they want to go fish so.....

Pete Hassemer [00:04:54] Any other discussion? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:04:58] Thank you Chair Hassemer. You know with the Magnuson- Stevens Act, it's a great Act, right? A lot of good things in it. But to really do it properly you've got to have a lot of

inputs and you have a lot of money, and we don't have a lot of money with the resources we had last year. And so I think that even when money was good it wasn't enough, and so the MSA is a, can be a harsh mistress. I think about the quillback situation, right? We're basically going down a path that we can't get off of. Everybody looks at it and says, we shouldn't be here, this is not right, but we had to go down that path. And I think there's a lot of freedom here, I think, in the way we're going. And I think that the MSA doesn't fit necessarily everything. Stock synthesis, does it fit every fishery or every species and be able to acknowledge that. I don't think tomorrow, or whenever this is all fully implemented, that there's not going to be....it's going to be the wild west. I think about the cartoon we've all seen with the nuclear explosion in the background with the two guys on the lake and he says, "I'll tell you what this means, Norm, no size restrictions and screw the limit". This is not the nuclear explosion in the background. I don't think you're going to see much difference on the water. For the stateside, I would imagine mimic, for the most part, what we're doing right now and they're going to adjust to it a little more in their own, on their timeline, not ours. This Council's been overtaxed, I think, quite a bit because we're trying to do too much with too little, so I think that I feel good that this is the right decision and I think that everybody will be better off when we finally get to everybody's settled down in a few years and we get in the position where we think we're comfortable with it. I know that the Pacific States meeting last week I know there was a resolution for money to the states in the transition. I would hope....we had a good discussion this morning with Lynn talking about their concerns. I think there's a lot of things that need to be worked out here and I would hope that the powers to be would acknowledge that and fund the key things that fisheries need. It's just because the fisheries are, the states are going to be managing things instead of us, that those services will still be provided because nothing's really changed in that sense. So anyway, appreciate the motion and yeah, thank you.

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

Keeley Kent [00:08:09] Thank you, I realized I missed one other point from Ms. Ridings points that I wanted to bring up and a couple of you have triggered that recollection. I want to speak briefly on, so if the Council votes and moves this forward on the implementation parts of it, and I certainly heard in the past week some questions, and I do think that's a part we haven't talked about as much on this floor. I think thinking through implementation on these various steps, for me on this action we have a lot of flexibility and this would be the time and place I would use that flexibility. I have no plans of here's the timeline, and gosh we are going to be hard up on it, right, because that isn't appropriate for this action. What we see as opportunities, not only to not just do one rulemaking but to split things apart, has it make sense. And to me that looks like conversations, in particular with the tribes and the states, before implementation laying out those plans. We don't want to create any chaos in the system, not only for ourselves and spex, which I've had a lot of conversations with folks about. I have no reason to make spex harder than it already is, but I also want to make sure that for any of these species that are removed where any of the states are making plans, that we have that conversation and we work together on that timeline. I have that flexibility on my side. I will be using that to work with folks. And to me what that looks like, too, is periodically reporting back to the Council, here's what we've come up with, here's when we think we'll do this, that, and the other thing, right? That's what that look like to me and so I want to hopefully give some folks some, take a breath on the planning, right? It should be a careful transition. We don't want to create any additional challenges for fishermen on the water and for the states and the tribes who may choose to pick up additional work with these species. And so we'll work with everyone on that and we will report to the Council how that looks. That, I think, has sort of always been my plan, and I apologize if I haven't said that out loud to everybody enough, but that would be how we approach this if this is the direction the Council is ready to go.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:37] Thank you. Any other discussion? David Sones.

David Sones [00:10:43] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think I should state, you know, from the tribal

perspective we do feel pretty comfortable with the way this process has gone. It's easy for us to get forgotten being one of this, you know in one state when you're dealing with three states. But our people have been involved. You know, when I first saw this I was pretty uncomfortable. I've gone through the process of, when we managed fisheries in the Council as rockfish, flatfish, groundfish, and issued permits like they were selling candy out there, and it resulted in us overfishing and then having to reduce the fleet at a high cost and crashing certain species that, you know, that's the result of why we have all of these species identified and have to look at them individually to make sure that we're not overfishing and sustaining these species. We have our obligations that our tribal people have understood forever that we are the keepers of these resources because we're the ones that impact them the most and we have to be good stewards of them, and in order to do that we have understand on an individual basis how they fit into the ecosystem and how we affect that. So when we were looking at removing species from fisheries management plans I got pretty nervous about it, but as I started going through and looking at the species that are being considered and how the states and the federal government manage those resources, we became more comfortable with where this was trying to go. And we do believe we maintain the species that we need to keep in the, in the plans. And so I just really wanted to express I will be supporting this motion, but there has been a lot of stress over are we doing the right thing? Are we prepared to deal with the individual species if needed with the states and the tribes? But I am comfortable with where we're at and I just wanted to make that statement. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:06] Thank you David. Further discussion? Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:13:13] Thank you Chair Hassemer. Thank you Miss Mattes for your very eloquent statement at the beginning of this, because it really encompassed a lot of what I've been feeling. And as somebody who's been on the other side of this table for the majority of these last three years I'm kind of getting like an adrenaline dump, like it's almost emotional. But I really appreciate Miss Hall, your comment that this really is kind of a California-centric motion just with the species on there and looking at all of the species that are very specific to California, or predominantly a California-type stock. And this, the last three years has been incredibly stress and anxiety inducing on stakeholders. I know for the Council, Jessi and Todd and Katrina and the amount of work y'all have put on this, talking us through it over and over and over again, answering the same questions with us hoping we'd get a different answer. Keeley coming in and talking to us over and over and over again. And so it's a lot but I appreciate the dialogue that we've had with our state on how we will be able to move forward. This doubles the work for stakeholders as far as where they now have to go to engage on groundfish issues, so this is not something that simplifies things for stakeholders, but we've kind of seen it as this is an inevitability, not something we have much of a choice in. And so I just, I appreciate everything that's been said today. And yeah, that's kind of all there is. It's a bit of a plop at this point I feel like. So thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:35] Thank you. Any other discussion? Not....oh, Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:15:44] Yeah, thank you. Kind of debated on saying something because I have not been as engaged as probably some of our groundfish stakeholders like Miss Diamond was lining out for on the water, but I do want to recognize the amount of work that's been done by the states and the tribes and my confidence in what they are doing. This, I was telling Ms. Mattes that it reminds me a lot of when IPHC came to us when I was first a Council member and said, Council you're going to be doing halibut. And we all said wait, what? I mean, we had a process where we were engaged with them but we were not actively managing halibut. That was a big change for us and I feel like this is a big change as well in terms of moving fisheries from one entity to another. But I do have confidence in the states. I am grateful that everybody is willing to take that work on. But I do just want to reflect for a moment on the fact that some of this, you know we've heard budget come up, we do have limited resources here. But at some point, even though it's outside of the Council purview, when we keep pushing things to others and resources continue to get scarcer, we need to be prepared to live with what

those realities are. And I have every faith in those that we are putting our faith in, but I do think that we need to be very mindful that this will create additional workload for our state departments and that it may impact what we see at the Council based upon the resources that they have themselves. So supportive of what I see here this morning. And again, greatly appreciative of the work that has been done behind the scenes to make a motion that most of us can get on board with.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:11] Thank you Christa. Further discussion? I'm not seeing any hands then I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:18:23] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:25] Opposed?

Corey Ridings [00:18:26] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:26] Abstentions? Thank you, the motion passes with one no vote. Miss Corey Ridings. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:46] Thank you sir. I've got two more motions to cover the rest, some more things. So if we could have Motion Number 3. I move the Council adopt as FPA Alternative 3, identifying the below species as not in need of conservation and management in the EEZ but should remain in the FMP designated as ecosystem component species: Bronzespotted, flag, greenblotched, Mexican, rosy, speckled, and tiger rockfish. Butter sole, curlfin sole, rock sole, sand sole, and starry flounder. And then there's some guidance. The guidance on ecosystem component species checkpoint for reevaluation. The Council would request Council staff and the Groundfish Management Team work to develop a checkpoint for mortality of ecosystem component species to prompt reevaluation of the stock being an EC species in time for the November 2026 meeting, which is the next time the groundfish mortality report will be available. Thank you to Miss Ames for reminding me that, or showing me the updated Year-At-A-Glance with not much groundfish in September. Checkpoints could be based on exceeding recent mortality by a certain percentage. The last year of ACL or ACL contribution for a species as shown in tables 11 through 17 in Agenda Item G.2, Attachment 1 is an example. A percentage increase of mortality from one year to the next or an analysis similar to what the GMT did in their Report 1 from June 2025. This list is not intended to be inclusive but rather a starting point for ideas.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:44] Thank you Lynn. As I followed along everything on the screen appeared accurate and complete.

Lynn Mattes [00:20:49] Yes sir, it did.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:50] All right, is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:21:01] Thank you sir. Again, this is the culmination of a lot of work by a lot a folks. The 10-factor analysis work by the GMT, the SSC, and the GAP indicated that these species, while not key targets of any of our fisheries, they are some that probably should stay in the FMP and at least be checked-in on regularly, but they aren't in need of active management. Plus this gives me the opportunity to talk about my favorite fish, starry flounder for a moment. So there currently isn't a targeted fishery on any of these species but we can watch them if there were any. And then so that it's not a set it and forget it with our EC species, the guidance is intended to find a way to have some metric that we look at when we get the GEMM Report every year from NMFS to say this one needs some more....when something's going on here we need to look into this. You know as an example, Mexican

rockfish had seen a bit of an increase here in the last year or so, was it just a pulse of fish that came in for a year? Things like that could warrant some additional information. This isn't as prescriptive as what we have with shortbelly, which says if we reach a certain point then we will take a management action. We may get there at some point but this seems like a good way to start those discussions. And yeah, I think that's it for this one.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:44] Thank you Lynn. Questions for clarification on the motion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:22:50] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just as a matter of general input, this motion wouldn't preclude the GAP from weighing-in on this, the checkpoints. Is that your intent here? Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:09] Through the Chair, that is correct. This would not preclude anybody from weighing-in on if we're seeing mortality or fishery changes.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:19] Further questions for clarification? Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:23:22] Thank you Mr. Chair, and thank you Miss Mattes for the proposal. Two questions about the checkpoints. First of all, I'm sorry I can't quickly find the GMT Report from June 2025, but does that include economic importance? And the second question is, was there some reason why there wasn't guidance for re-evaluation under the first motion, or second motion was the one that took species out. Thank you Miss Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:59] Through the Chair, Dr. Lent, the GMT Report from June 2025 did not specifically go into economic importance, it just looked at mortality. What has the recent mortality been and by sector? That's all it looked at. Don't have a real good answer of why we didn't have specific guidance on those other species. I just know that there has been concern about EC, designating species as EC because they are caught in the fishery but just maybe not a target to provide, for the lack of a better term, I know a lot of folks around this process hate this, a roadmap of some sort to examine it again. At any time we can re-examine any of these species going forward. They're just, there seemed to be a little more concern about these species that are currently, and the current EC species as well as the ones on this list that we're adding.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:02] Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:25:04] If I could add to Ms. Mattes' answer on the economic part of things, I would say I see in this list we're watching for a change in fishery dynamics. I think one of the big things with EC species is that you're looking for a potential switch to targeting, right, and there's a catch part of that that you can see a signal, but that absolutely has an economic part of it and then I think I appreciate Miss Mattes building or setting the framework to build a checkpoint for us all. Then I think once you get over that checkpoint, really what we're going back to then is a 10-factor analysis, and as you know there are economic considerations as part of that and so I think just sort of flagging that as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:50] Thank you. Other questions for clarification? I'm not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:00:00] Thanks Chair. I'd like to offer an amendment.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:04] Please go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:00:05] Yeah, could I ask the tower of power to scroll up to the top of the motion? Thank you. So my amendment would be to strike the following fishes from the left side of the table there. So strike bronzespotted, flag, greenblotched, rosy, and speckled. That's it.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:40] All right, excuse me. I think we need to get the language correct now so that....ah, they're working on the motion language so....okay, I believe it might be complete so I'm going to ask you the language that is up there in that sentence and the highlighted species are the correct ones?

Corey Ridings [00:02:10] They are. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:12] All right, is there a second to the motion? And I am not seeing a second.

Heather Hall [00:02:25] Chair, I'll second for the opportunity for discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:30] Okay. Seconded by Heather Hall. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Ridings [00:02:34] Thanks Chair. Again, thanks Miss Mattes for offering this. I appreciate the thought here. I will note that I have a motion to offer following this to address the species which I'm recommending removal here. I'm recommending removal based on the report of the SSC that pulled out these five species as being recommended for remaining in active management. This is due to the vulnerability of these species and or the historical catch levels that indicate that they, especially as we move forward with hopefully some spatial closure openings, that these species will likely be in need of active conservation and management.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:28] Thank you. Are there questions for clarification on the motion? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:03:39] Thank you. I don't think I can support this amendment because I keep coming back to the analysis, and I don't think these changes are supported by the conclusions and findings in the analysis about these species not being in need of conservation and management in the EEZ. I'll note, you know, I really appreciate the part of the motion that Ms. Mattes has started to set up, which is the checkpoint, and I absolutely support that. There are things that could change in the future, but the information that we have right now is that those conditions haven't changed yet and so I think we have to act on what we have right now, and we have a system that is adaptive and flexible, and we have made this specific change, moving a species from EC into the fishery before, so I know it can happen. And I appreciate putting the more meat on the bones of how it will happen when we will look at it. I think that's helpful. And to me, I would be uncomfortable acting on something that could happen in the future that I don't know what it will look like and I don't know what the results of a different 10-factor analysis would be, but we'll have a system to keep track of it and I think that's important. So I won't be supporting this amendment but I appreciate the opportunity to discuss it.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:51] Thank you. Other discussion? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:04:53] Thank you Chair. I'm also just echoing what Keeley said. I am confident that with the list that Miss Mattes offered for how to reconsider that we'll be able to catch anything that happens that might require management for these species in the future. I'm also noting that this is not the last motion. We're not moving these out of the FMP. We are still holding them in a place where we can keep some track of them, so I won't vote in support of it.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:24] Other discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:05:30] Thank you Mr. Chair. Likewise, I won't be supporting this amendment. I'm not compelled by the idea that just because they're vulnerable they need to be, continue to be actively managed. I think any rockfish species at any point could be vulnerable, susceptible, and so the framework under EC I think is appropriate given we've identified little to no mortality, no targeting, almost zero to minimal economic value of these. I think that the framework and the check-in system is needed and is important and I think that there's maybe some more ideas out there. We heard a very great one in our morning California delegation meeting about looking at catch composition, how much each of these are actually a proportion of total catch beyond just has it jumped in mortality. There's a lot of indicators, I think, that give us a lot of good signals as to whether or not these need to be brought back in and have more active management rather than being watched with better sidebars so. but I appreciate the discussion and thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:41] Other discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:06:46] Thank you Chair Hassemer. And yes, I really appreciate this discussion. I also want to... I want to acknowledge the guidance that is, I think, a really important part of this motion and it keeps our eyes on these species as they're still included in the FMP, the importance of monitoring that we have that will allow us to reconsider or think about these if catch changes or we see different things in the fishery. So I think the motion as originally offered captures that idea and I won't be supporting this, but thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:37] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:07:40] Thanks Chair. I should have opened by thanking Miss Mattes for her guidance on this. I very much appreciate it and it's definitely heading in a direction that I also would like to see in terms of overall how we use our EC species tool in our overall management portfolio, but until that is in place and knowing exactly what that looks like, I think that active management for these species is warranted. I appreciate the thoughts around the table that that will hopefully provide what we need or think we need to adequately conserve and manage these species, but until we have that I think that active management is warranted. I'll note that movement of species between EC category and active management are rare. I appreciate what Miss Kent noted that that has happened. It has, but it is very rare, not done frequently. Also thinking about the vulnerability of these species, that was established using, I believe it was the methodology from Cope et al, and I apologize I don't know the year on that publication, but considered best practice if not BSIA. So that was something that the Council has looked at in the past, reviewed in the past, is in, I believe it's in the groundfish FMP, so there is intended a specific definition to that vulnerability not just in a general sense. So just wanted to add that to the conversation. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:15] Any further discussion? And not seeing any hands then I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Corey Ridings [00:09:26] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:29] Opposed?

Council [00:09:31] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:34] Abstentions? The motion fails. And the record, of course, will indicate Corey Ridings voted yes. Thank you. So we are back to the main motion now as presented. Is there further discussion on this motion? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:10:06] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And to clarify, Lynn, I know you brought up the guidance with respect to these new species, but I'm assuming that guidance really does apply more broadly to the species that are already EC species plus the ones this motion would add?

Lynn Mattes [00:10:29] Through the Chair, Miss Kiefer, that is correct. You know earlier this meeting we saw the, we call it the GEMM Report, the Total Mortality Report from the NMFS folks who work to put that together. And I know I go through that and look at it, but yeah, it is not intended to just be the new species but the current EC species as well.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:53] Other discussion? Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:10:57] I just appreciate that you're leaving this open to other metrics to look at this. It's not an exhaustive list so thank you. I know the GAP had some ideas, so thank you Miss McKnight for explicitly making sure the GAP can still have a little say, but yeah, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:18] Other discussion? Not seeing any then I will call the question on this motion. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:11:29] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:31] Opposed?

Corey Ridings [00:11:35] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:35] Abstentions? The motion passes. Corey Ridings voting no. Thank you Lynn for that motion. And as you indicated there might be another one?

Lynn Mattes [00:11:50] Yes sir, there is one more. Hopefully this one is a simpler one. And then after this motion there is some additional information we wanted to present. So it may look like we're done, but there's some additional stuff we want to talk about after this piece. So with that, I move the Council adopt the language in the FMP as shown in Agenda Item G.2, Attachment 2, September 2025. Requesting staff make any modifications necessary to comport to the Council's FPA.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:26] All right. I tried to follow along there, but that looks accurate, complete?

Lynn Mattes [00:12:30] Yes sir, it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:31] Is there a second to the..... Seconded by Brad Pettinger. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:37] Thank you sir. This is just allowing Council staff, hopefully with the Executive Director's approval, to update Attachment 2 based on the previous motions we've made today.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:51] Thank you. Questions for clarification? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? No discussion. I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:13:06] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:08] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. And with that, before you get to that, let's make sure we have the task list up here.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:25] This guidance will help address the task list, I think, but let's go ahead with your plan. Thank you sir.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:35] All right. Lynn, the floor is yours.

Lynn Mattes [00:13:41] All righty, thank you sir. There we go. Some folks may have noticed who are very keen that there were some species not included in any of the previous motions. So to provide some additional information for clarity, the state folks met last night and thought we should provide this additional information so that everybody around the table or online, et cetera, know what is going on. So for clarity, the species in the following table are not currently included in any of the motions, as such they will remain in the FMP at this time. This leaves the opportunity for further discussion between the states of Washington and Oregon, the Tribes and NMFS over winter. We would like to add an agenda item in March to consider further action of these species with a possible check-in in November. And the species are black rockfish, Oregon. Blue and deacon rockfish, state specific for Oregon and Washington. Cabezon for Washington. China rockfish, state specific Oregon and Washington. Copper rockfish, Oregon and Washington combined stock. Kelp greenling, Washington. And quillback rockfish, Oregon. With this guidance there is....we are not intending or requesting any additional analysis from Council staff. We do not anticipate the GMT or GAP needing to do any work over this wintertime period. This is just a bit of a pause on action to allow some additional coordination and communication between Washington, Oregon, NMFS and with our Tribal co-managers, but we felt it was appropriate to spell it out and have it in writing for everyone to see what the plan is.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:32] All right, thank you Lynn. And with that, of course, the third bullet point opens up when we get to our workload planning, that can be discussed there. Appreciate you laying out the staffing or workload issues associated with that. Any reactions to this? Heather Hall, then Aja Szumylo.

Heather Hall [00:15:54] Thank you Miss Mattes. And I appreciate the clarity this provides with where we ended up. As discussed in the WDFW Report, we requested additional time to talk about management of these species and we really appreciate the time this affords us for those conversations. Where we are now leaves all species caught in the Washington recreational fishery and several in Oregon in the FMP. We appreciate the importance of salmon and halibut fisheries in Washington, but recreational groundfish are often said to be the bread and butter of our coastal sport fisheries. That is, they sustain recreational opportunity and support coastal communities in times when salmon and halibut quotas are low. We've been concerned with the process that removes these stocks that are the drivers of the economically important recreational bottomfish fishery off Washington from the FMP before fully understanding the impacts. For example, how changing the stocks listed in the FMP may or may not affect state and federal fishery monitoring programs to support stock assessment and management under the FMP. The FMP success is founded on state, federal, tribal cooperation on science and monitoring. Pulling these integrated programs apart may increase costs and reduce overall capacity. Our intent in having these discussions is not to do so with a blind eye to resource issues at NMFS or simply because we don't want to change how we're doing things. For example, we see the potential for delegating certain functions to the states for improving efficiencies. WDFW has a very strong foundation of conservation that we apply to state managed species as well as through our participation in management forums under other jurisdictions. Although I acknowledge at times it has felt this way, we don't think a decision to remove these stocks out of the FMP is inevitable and see the MSA and National Standard 3 as providing a pathway that allows us to continue to manage with that cooperative approach across jurisdictions. And again, I'll just conclude by saying we do appreciate the opportunity to have those discussions. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:15] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:18:18] Thank you Chair, and thank you Heather for that. And thank you for the clarifying discussion Lynn. I just wanted to ask what this means in terms of the overall action? And I don't really see it outlined here. So do we close out the rest of it and then pick something else back up later, or what does this look like going forward from here?

Pete Hassemer [00:18:41] Keeley Kent, I see you're willing to answer that.

Keeley Kent [00:18:45] I will wade in. Thank you. It's a good question. I think with this I'll track back to, we have actually already taken multiple actions, not even just under phase 2, but the amendments that came before that, right? So this whole thing has already been broken up into many exciting adventures. And sorry, not making jest of this being hard, right? It's not normal, right? I'll acknowledge that. That's not normally how we do our actions, but this one has been a little, slightly easier to be able to break that up. So I'm just noting we've already done that. I think it's okay. The naming of it matters less to me, but I'm certain that we can take that input. I think you're asking sort of a bigger question, but I think there's also sort of the logistics. Is this another Phase 2 discussion in March? Is this phase 3? You know, I'll remind you that there is actually a couple other things that back in March 2022 the agency notified the Council about that. I'm aware we haven't forgotten, right? We still need to come back to stock complexes. We have always planned to come back to the discussion on delegation. So there are continued pieces. I think we have the ability to look at the final action that the Council has already taken on this and determine, and I'll sort of wedge this in with what I've already said is like, this is a complicated enough action with spin-offs that we will come back to the Council and tell you all here's what we're thinking about when we move forward this piece and while we keep having that, the discussion on these pieces. So I'm going to take the flexibility on this one to try to do it in the best way. I would leave it to the Council and Council staff sort of how they, what they call that March discussion, but it is not abnormal to me with how we've been expecting that we still have more work to be done in general.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:53] Thank you. Todd Phillips.

Todd Phillips [00:20:55] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I Just wanted to confirm, because being a bean-checker here, with Miss Mattes for March, that is March 2026 and November is November 2025?

Pete Hassemer [00:21:05] Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:21:12] Through the Chair, Mr. Phillips, that is correct. It was late in the day and I forgot to add years, but yes, March 2026 and November 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:24] Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:21:26] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for these additional notes Miss Mattes. I just wanted to add that I very much have appreciated the discussions this week and I very much respect that both the state of Oregon and Washington have very different situations than California and that we've been able to come to the table and talk about those differences and talk about the approaches in a way that wasn't about disagreement, but acknowledgement that we're all in different places. I would say that I'd like to extend thanks to Miss Kent and NMFS for the extraordinary amount of flexibility and transition that you described under I think Motion 2, that California plans to utilize that flexibility and take our time, in that while we have a lot of regulatory infrastructure in place and that there should be a very seamless transition, we do expect to take some time to make sure that we've got everything covered appropriately. So this doesn't necessarily mean that we won't be having maybe

some updates in November of 25' or March of 26' either. But thank you again, I appreciate the discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:39] Thank you. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:22:42] Thank you Chair. I just also wanted to make some general remarks. I appreciate the remarks from Miss Mattes, Miss Hall, Miss McKnight as well. I think coming into this meeting, right, it's been....I think we've been transparent as an agency. We would have liked to get to final action on all of these things, but we have heard the states and the tribes that there are a few that are more difficult than others and we will take that time to have those conversations. I think that's important. We do want to keep healthy and maintain these relationships that we have and so this I think allows us that time to have these good conversations. And so we appreciate where we have gotten to on this and and we'll recognize, right, that this is a short list, and it's a hard list but it's a short list, and I think it's important to point that out that we've had, we made progress, we found some common ground through this entire action, that's important to note. I appreciate that and we will, I'll look forward to those conversations over winter on this last grouping of species.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:47] Thank you. As we go through, thanks for bringing that back up. I'm not going to cut off any discussion, but have a check-in here on our action items or our Council tasks and then see what else we should do here? So Katrina take us through how we've done up to this point. And if the screen went black on you.

Katrina Bernaus [00:24:16] Thank you Mr. Chair. You've done very well. Of the 42 species that were under consideration today under this action, the Council has adopted a Final Preferred Alternative for all but eight stocks of those species. The Council has also adopted FPA stock definition options for those species that were adopted under Alternative 1, which was four stocks of species. And you've adopted revised language to the FMP to be revised as appropriate to support the FPA decision-making. You've also provided significant guidance on next steps regarding the revisiting of ecosystem component species, as well as revisiting the eight stocks of species that you were not ready to take final action on today. So with that, I think your business is done today.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:16] All right, thank you. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:25:20] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just one question of clarification for Miss Kent. So the actions taken to date, unless you or the other Council, the rest of the Council would not like this, we would intend to transmit to you what's been done so far and then that will be in your hands to do with what you do. But if there's a different timing or this Council doesn't like that timing, now would be the time to let me know.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:49] Keeley.

Keeley Kent [00:25:49] Thank you. That is a good question. I think we have historically worked well on transmittal timelines because I know a lot of folks are clear on the requirements under the MSA of what happens when an FMP amendment is formally transmitted. I see the, right, we normally talk about an informal transmittal, right? We will begin work on the items that the Council has taken final action on in the same way that we normally do. I don't have a forecast of those timelines on rulemakings, but I don't see it any different than normal. This one perhaps will look at the timelines of actions. And we have been exploring having different rulemakings come out of this because they're such different pieces, right, and we have not moved forward yet on even the June FPA. So I think in the same way that we are looking at the implementation timing, right, that's also a conversation with Council staff. So it's moving forward on the FPA and working with Council staff as we always do on those FMP amendment

transmittal timelines. I don't see that as any different. But this is likely not a one rulemaking package coming out of this meeting, and we already had a different rulemaking package out of June that we have not yet made progress on, and so that's a conversation. That is a very detailed answer. And you're looking at me like I didn't....I made it worse for you, I apologize, but yeah I'll stop there.

Merrick Burden [00:27:31] Yeah, thanks Miss Kent. I take your response to mean that we don't need to hold everything until March. We'll continue to work together and we can submit packages to you in pieces that make sense.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:44] All right, thank you. Before we close this out I want to make sure there's no other comments, points to be made. Not seeing any we will close this out.

3. Adopt Stock Assessments

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our public comment, the reports, and takes us to our Council tasks, which is there, fairly short but substantial, adopt the stock assessments for use in management as appropriate. Who wants to start that discussion? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:00:26] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. Stock assessments. I've got a little saying about that, I think stock assessments are like a box of chocolates, you never can tell what you get until you open them up. And truly, I don't know what's going into them, I just know what is going on in the water and I make a lot of assumptions based on that and It's nothing surprised both ways. Before I get into that, though, I'd just like to say that I thought that the few.....leading up until this stock assessment process, I thought the last few cycles had been lacking in outreach, I think, from the Science Centers, but also hands out from the fleet to interact with those folks, and I think we suffered because of that. And I that I think the Science Center's hurt us. I think in this last year I think there's a lot of good stuff happened. And I think that that's a....I'm very appreciative of that and I think that it's going to do us well as we move into the future here. I think communication is essential to success and virtually everything we do. And I think we've heard from the fleet that getting input from those folks on the water who have been there for literally decades and seeing how the ocean changes and see how fish behave and where they catch them and where you used to catch them, and I think those are all very, very important to really fully understand what's happening on the water. I will say this last year as far as the results, I mean if you had told me that rougheye blackspotted rockfish was where it's at I'd go, huh, I'm somewhat shocked but I don't know all that goes into that, but it sounds....that's the part of the box of chocolate things. But if you had told me that black cod's been overfished for 25 years straight, I'd be saying I'm shocked too. So I'm not saying that's necessarily what it is, but that's just the results we've got. But I think the assessment folks, they really care. I think they do good work and I think that they're going to benefit from the changes that we've seen this year as we move forward. It's not perfect. I think there's things we could probably do in this process to make things better. You know we don't have an off-ramp. We say, hey this is not looking.....you know this thing's not coming together, I think you should be able to pull the plug and admit by the way up front that you're not going to run things through just because you have to. I think that's the kind of flexibility you probably need. I think about the moving widow into a meeting in October, I'd certainly say yes. There's some potential of success there. Yellowtail, I listened to Dr. Field's talk and I get it. I don't think there's probably much....I think we're where we're at, right? We're going to have to live that for a couple of years at least and that's just what we're going to get. We have a government shutdown looming. I don't know if even the work on widow's going to happen. Realistically, let's be honest about where we're at here. But I certainly think that we need to be cognizant of that fact and if it doesn't, if there isn't time or it isn't, yeah if we have a shutdown and we can't get that done, what do we do? And I think we probably should maybe figure out that today or certainly at least understand that moving into November what we're going to have on the table. As far as the time-varying sigma issue with what was presented to us, I agree with what Jaime Diamond brought up about the process here and we need to stick to that process and I think that I agree with the GMT and the GAP on that. So other than that, I think it's just these are tough.....these assessments go into effect and they affect us for quite a while, some more than others, and it affect communities, it affects up coastwide. And I'm really happy to see that the quillback issue got resolved fairly quickly. It don't seem like it. And I remember that....I remember when Jaime giving her testimony like in 21' on that and just tore my heart out because I had the gavel and there was nothing I could do when it obviously had an assessment that probably should have been pulled. So I think that I'll just reiterate that I think an off-ramp would be nice to have in this process. That's probably for maybe the next agenda item but I shouldn't, I don't think I can repeat that enough. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, thank you for having a few minutes to speak to this and thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:31] All right. Other discussion? Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:05:34] Thank you Chair Hassemer. I'll echo everything Brad said. And I just, I'm hearing, I've heard the question from different places over the weekend, especially since we had the workshop, why do fishermen maybe feel like fishery-dependent data is more reliable or intimating that fishery.....like what they're seeing is more reliable or more accurate? And I'm not sure, I don't necessarily have the answer for that so much as we want to be heard and we want it to have this at least similar weight. Not that it....it seems more accurate to us because it's what we're seeing but we don't always feel that the fishery-dependent data is getting the same weight and respect that fishery-independent data gets, and that's part of whatever process it is and not for me to necessarily say here or there. But when industry works directly with science to try and get that right, really hard to try to fix a problem, to try fill those gaps that we're told exist and get the funding to do it, work to create a scientific method to do it, and then you see in for example, although the quillback assessment came out, that showing of course it was never overfished to begin with, if you read through that it shows that they didn't know what to do with the different sampling projects, even though we worked with the Science Centers to create these sampling projects to fill the need, they struggled to make that fit in in this fleet that they created and it got pulled out. And data that's been used since like 2015 got pulled out because they didn't like how it fits, different folks in the panel didn't like how it fit in the model. And that's where we're struggling and fighting to get what we're seeing, what fishermen are seeing on the water to have some weight to that because it feels like we're kind of getting cut out of it. We don't do anything, then nothing happens. If we do something, it's not good enough. We do something with the Science Center, somehow that's still not quite fitting in there yet. And so I think this is definitely strides and we're getting there and I think we just need to work together a little more to figure out how to make these new data streams fit better to get them to work in there. I'm of course thrilled that the quillback assessment came out the way it did and all that, but I just wanted to touch on that because we keep hearing this kind of notion of fishermen feeling like either their information or their data is more accurate or what's happening isn't accurate, and I just need to put it out there that we're trying and we're trying to help fill the gaps that exist and we trying to work with those that take the information and do something with it, but when you see that even then it's still not quite good enough, that's where we kind of keep feeling put down. That's where fishermen's voices keep saying they're feeling put down. So, thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:10] Thank you. Keeley Kent, and then Corey Niles.

Keeley Kent [00:09:14] Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for the comments Mr. Pettinger and Ms. Diamond. That's really helpful as I was thinking about this process and frankly the past couple cycles, like everyone else, have also been on this journey for the past couple of cycles and it has been a challenging one. I have seen some, I think, helpful changes this cycle. I do also want to emphasize and recognize I thought the, and I don't know if we would call it going back to what we used to do before, but the presentations I thought were really helpful working at chipping away at those pieces. But I'm trying to think through some of what we seem to be caught in a reactionary pattern on some of these things and trying to figure out how do we gather some of this information from the fleet before we start, because it seems very challenging the timing of when it's coming in, and I recognize that as in my own job of saying oftentimes it feels like things are too late and that is really challenging, so I have been trying to think about how could we harness that information and the.....I'll share this is the germ of an idea that I'm happy for people to tell me is the wrong one, but almost an information bank, right? Because when these....I agree that sometimes we're waiting until we get a result to know how we feel about it and then we hear about it quickly and then it is challenging, right, because we have these timelines that often feel unmovable. And so I'm thinking about what are the opportunities even before the pre-assessment workshops to have that information on hand and could we harness the information and experience from the industry and building like an information bank for the species that are going

to be assessed so that it is there before we start the process, and perhaps the industry would like to nominate two to three people that are the best contacts initially when there are questions and so that we can help the process by having that information already available, right? So we're shifting from reacting on what is the result look like and where does that concern us to having that ready. This is, again a germ of an idea. I will be wrong if this is the wrong way to....but that's what I'm trying to think through, is like there's an energy and a need here and I think there's a way to look at it and how do we pull those pieces together? How do we create something tangible to respond to this moment that's been happening now for many cycles? I want to work with you all on that and work with the industry on that and so those are the kinds of things I'm trying to figure out. Could we build something there?

Pete Hassemer [00:12:20] Thank you. Corey Niles, then Lynn Mattes, then Aja Szumylo. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:12:24] Yeah, thanks. That's really interesting, I mean I hope that's what we talk about in the next agenda item Keeley. And so much to respond to already I'll try to keep it brief, but I hope we all just acknowledge how much work goes into it from the Science Centers from how many weeks Marlene and Todd spent in Star Panels and GMT and GAP, and so thanks to everyone for the effort. And Jaime just, I'm hearing so much willingness to work constructively and witnessed you all from afar and what happened with quillback and all the efforts. I'm hearing the same thing from the Science Centers. I've seen it for years. I remember Brad, so it's people with good intentions on all sides and how do we do it better and you're making us think we spent, I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions on our black rockfish tagging project and that got thrown out at the Star Panel. We've had, I remember being at the Montesano lab watching our bios' process lingcod fin clips, which is how you age lingcod and those got, hours and hours and hours of those got thrown out, but never a doubt that the stock assessment folks are doing that because yeah, they're trying to get the best and most unbiased result, and so it just takes a lot of dialogue. And I will try to end it with Brad, your box of chocolates is sigma, and I'm going to, you're going to understand that when we're done with this, that's sigma is telling you that these assessments are a box of chocolates. It's telling you how wide it is and a time varying thing is it's telling you yeah it's getting wider over time and half the time it's going to be like 30% too low or and it's going to be 40% too high, that's what they're telling us, but we need to.....like Yelena's, which she ended her testimony with, yes this is.....these are having economic consequences. So that's, I think we have a long way to go but realizing that we have this volatility and how do we mitigate the economic impacts? I think there's a big conversation to be had, but not today, but we're just adopting assessments here and also, yeah really thankful for people willing to keep looking at the widow assessment. And I'll....I might have more comments on motions but that's all, I'll stop there for now. And again, thanks to everyone for making this process work and participating in it.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:43] All right, thank you Corey. After Lynn Mattes we'll have Aja Szumylo, then Rebecca Lent. Lynn.

Lynn Mattes [00:14:50] Thank you Chair. Kind of echo a lot of the things that have been said around here but also the listening session, workshop, whatever we want to call it that we had on Saturday I think was very fruitful. We used to do something like that as an evening session a few cycles ago before COVID. An evening after sitting in Council room, sitting in GMT room, that's maybe not the best use of our time. I know I don't always have the brain power. Often times we have other times to work. And I was kind of sitting in the back of the room during those presentations and the amount of head nods I saw and quick scrambling of notes and there was a couple of times I swear I could see a light bulb go off on top of somebody's head which was neat to see. I know it's extra time and expense and we'll have to figure that out as we go forward, but I think something similar to that will be useful going forward and hopefully next cycle it'll be at a meeting where our GAP and GMT are here in-person as well. Yes, they were able to participate remotely and really appreciate those who took the time, but I do want to.....I hope we can continue something of that nature going forward. I think it ultimately saves us time

here on the Council floor. Also the communicating our science, communicating the research and the science, that is always a tough thing and it's something that is becoming more and more important. I am not a graphic designer. I don't think that way. Luckily I have some folks who I work with who do, so creating things like the one pagers or the quick link things, it was commented on and I was asked to pass along thanks from public in our delegation meeting this morning that that is a succinct way to try to communicate things and hope we can continue to do that, and maybe even ODFW and NMFS can work together so we're not duplicating each other's work. But just the efforts we've made to communicate I think is good. My first Star Panel, 2009, cabezon, during an extreme heat wave in Seattle, we were in the sub-basement of the Hotel Decca in the U District. I was the GMT rep. I was barely allowed in the room let alone at the table or to provide feedback. And now with remote meeting, being able to participate remotely, the GMT and the GAP are at the table. They're part of the discussions. They're a part of as things are going on. People can participate and listen remotely, they don't have to travel to Seattle or Santa Cruz. And we have the pre-assessment workshops. Again, not always ideal, but we've made strides and I hope we can continue to make strides moving forward. On the time-varying sigma new methodology, I'm all for improving our science, improving the way we estimate things, but I think it needs to get vetted through the correct process. Additionally, it's being proposed for three stocks when there's a number of others, and I don't know that there's the time or the workload capacity to look at the others. I'm also hesitant to do, apply that new methodology. Yeah, the paper has been in the TOR, but I don't think any of us looked at it and saw and thought about what it could imply. I don't want to know the results before we get it, but I do want to better understand what that means. So I would like us to delay, when it comes time, I would like us to delay implementing that new sigma until we as a Council can have some review and better understand what's going into it, how the calculations are made, and what it means. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:30] Thank you Lynn. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:18:33] Thank you Chair. And I'll try to keep it brief. A lot of good things have been said. I just want to echo the sentiment of good intentions on all sides. I remember when I worked at NOAA and being in the situation of having to share with industry that there was really challenging news coming from the assessment. I just want to emphasize here that, yeah there's so much scientific integrity from the Science Center and I know how hard being on that side of the table is and being on the side of getting through that kind of information is. And I know now on the other side of it being in industry how hard that news is in the other direction. And so I just want to reemphasize that both sides are hard and the only thing that carries through that is a lot of recognition that there is integrity and respect across the different people that play into this process. I'm really appreciative of the willingness for the Science Center to look harder at widow. And I want to really appreciate... I think Keeley was a really strong voice in asking for that pause. And I just, you know, I know that.....yeah, it was probably not hard to... It was probably not easy to say and probably not easy to hear that like that was what was needed right then, but I think that that was the right thing to do. And so I appreciate... I keep saying, see something, say something, but I appreciate you using that role, the role that you're in right now to see something say something about this and for all of us to like sit back a little bit and really think through this. I've had experiences in New England where that Council when I was over there was a little bit more willing in situations where there was a tricky answer from an assessment to take an alternative path, and so I've been trying to think about those situations in comparison to what we're dealing with out here a lot as we've been moving through things. What sits with me a lot too in sitting now in this seat, again the, and this is along with the see something, say something side of things, but it's not just the scientific information, it's us being able to respond as a body with management that addresses the science and conserves the stock, but then also buffers impact to industry in the right way. I heard a lot more discussion this time around, or sorry, I was not here during quillback so I don't know what you guys talked about, but I don't know that people as quickly talked about like, okay, what are phase-in options? What is the bag of tricks that we have to deal with things? And then... So yeah, I want

to say I'm happy that that is coming up like today well in advance of us getting whatever the outcome is later with the adjustments to the widow assessment. And then with that, I will put a plug into tying this to the spex flex action. This is exactly why we need those measures. It's like now.....I mean I think before we were doing the assessments, I don't know if there was hesitance to.....I sensed some hesitance from people to spend the time in that space, especially... I still hear a discussion of like, oh, why are groundfish things an emergency? Why is this troublesome this time? But I, having been in this fishery for a long time, have seen this come up over and over and over and again, we did it, it came up again this year once again, and if we had not been..... Industry was really courageous in asking for that set of solutions over patches that could have dealt with what happened with the three stocks that we're considering an emergency for right now. But I just want to make that throughline for people that like, that is why the tools to address management, or as the management body to address the scientific information that comes up in a flexible way are so important. So just reminding people not to forget the throughline there and that our job is the management and our job to take the science that they so carefully put together and make sure that industry can get through all of it at the end of the day. I'll stop.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:31] Thank you. Rebecca Lent, then Caroline McKnight.

Rebecca Lent [00:22:35] Thank you Chair. And a lot of smart people stole my talking points. But I'll just add a couple things. First of all, I remember being on my west coast tour last summer hearing from a fishery participant who was part of the survey, the regular survey, and saying, well why won't they let me go over here and survey over here because I know there's fish over here. That's difficult to understand, and it reminds me of what Andre said, Andre Punt on Saturday, he says, we're doing stock assessments and we don't always have survey data. Sometimes we're using fishery-dependent data. It should be possible. But the one thing I did hear was definitely so important was getting those samples. And it never dawned on me, you know I've been five foot six since I was in high school, but I'm getting older. You can't tell it from my height, but you can tell it I guess if you analyze my ear bones or something. That kind of thing you really need to know and that's where the fishery provides so much important information. Quillback, you know we all learned, and California pitched in and went in there. I think there's just been some great, great things at this Council. I can't imagine how it could be improved, but it sounds like we've got some ideas. The pre-assessment workshops, the monthly cope calls, the Saturday events, the at-a-glance, all these are great things, and I've seen people stop and say, wow, you're right, we learned from that. People are willing to turn around and look at what were you saying three years ago and why and learn from that, so I really appreciate it. Thank you very much.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:04] Thank you. Caroline.

Caroline McKnight [00:24:05] Thank you Mr. Chair. And I think we were having a similar thought sir, so I don't want to say too much that repeats that, but I will echo all the sentiments about the things that were very well done this cycle. The new one-pager, the 1 p.m. meeting on Saturday, it's a little unfortunate that our, because of unforeseen circumstances, that our GAP and our GMT couldn't be in here in-person as well, but I think there was a lot of benefit to that. And I just wanted to take a moment to say that we are going to continue to learn and adapt every single cycle from something and hindsight is always twenty-twenty, and right now I think what I'm focused on as the action before us is these time-varying sigmas and the application of some mathematics that was not clear to me was even a possibility, unless it was somewhere overt that I missed and can be....I stand corrected, it sounds like it has not made it through any kind of methodology or is not anywhere that our GAP or GMT had any benefit of, so I'm going to echo Lynn's comment as well that I'm not comfortable moving forward with the information or the mathematics that have been applied for those three species. At least under this agenda item it sounds like the 2 catch-only projections. And then just to make a comment relative to quillback rockfish. I believe deeply that our science staff are always endeavoring to provide the best quality product they can. I will again echo the appreciation for putting forward a full benchmark

assessment for quillback rockfish, and I believe that that produced a much higher quality output and set of parameters with some flexibility to put them through a very rigorous and robust review process that has created a whole lot more confidence, and I sure don't want something like time-varying sigma math that wasn't maybe as widely publicized to diminish that. Anyway, I think that I agree also that widow is a good candidate for supplemental review. I'm hearing there's not a lot of benefit for yellowtail to continue moving forward so I could stay neutral on that one as well. And I think that covers it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:33] Thank you. Covered a lot of discussion. Anything else? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:26:42] Thank you Chair. I'm not seeing any other hands go up, not to try to preclude anything, but when it's time I do have a motion ready and the tower of power has it available.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:52] We've had a lot of discussion. Let's see the motion and that could stimulate more.

Lynn Mattes [00:26:58] Thank you Chair. There we go. So I move the Council adopt the following stock assessments, stock categories, and sigmas for use in 2027 and beyond provided in the Council's September 2025 Briefing Book under Agenda Item G.3 as recommended by the SSC. For benchmark assessments: Yellowtail rockfish north of 40° 10', category 1b, sigma of 0.5. Chilipepper rockfish, coastwide, category 1b, initial sigma of 0.5. Quillback rockfish off of California, category 1b, sigma of .75. Sablefish, coastwide, category 1, sigma 0.5. Rougheye black spotted rockfish, coastwide, category 2, sigma of 1. For update assessment: Yelloweye rockfish, which was coastwide, category 1, and sigma 0.5. Catch-only projections, and all of these are coastwide: Petrale sole. Canary rockfish. Shortspine thornyhead. And darkblotched rockfish. And recommends that widow rockfish go to the supplemental review in October to be brought back for the November 2025 Council meeting as recommended by the SSC and GAP. And request that catch projections for black rockfish off Oregon and for bocaccio be provided using the original time-varying sigma rather than the modified time-varying sigma described in a Supplemental SSC Report for consideration at the November 2025 Council meeting.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:48] Thank you. As I listened everything on the screen was as you said, do you agree?

Lynn Mattes [00:28:53] Yes sir, I do.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:55] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Caroline McKnight. Thank you, please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:29:04] Thank you Chair. I believe the SSC and the GAP in places too laid out some pretty good recommendations for the benchmark assessments and the category. Do want to note the sigma in these tables is the initial sigma, this isn't the time-varying sigma. So where it says sigma is 0.5, that is no change. For the update assessment we do have yelloweye rockfish and yelloweye rockfish is projected to be at 40.1%, which is rebuilt. When I started in this process in 2008 yelloweye rockfish was projected to be rebuilt in 2084 and I hoped I wasn't going to still be in this process. Then it was 2072, then it was 2038 or 39', then it was 2029 and now here we are at 2025. It's just barely over there so we will likely be having some additional discussions under G.6, but it seemed, the update assessment seemed thorough and the SSC approved of it. The catch-only projections, there's four of them that are there. Again, the SSC was recommended those. For the widow rockfish, both the GAP and the SSC recommended that that go to what we used to call mop-up, the supplemental. And if we have the time and capacity I think it's worth taking another look at that, knowing that we could be looking at a government shutdown. To the piece about the time-varying sigma, Dr. Hamel and Dr. Wetzel are

extremely intelligent people who know more about, who will probably forget more about stock assessments than I will ever learn, and their paper has been published in a peer-reviewed journal, but we in this process have not had a chance to review it and understand the implications and what it means. Therefore it may be time to pause on that, use the original time-varying sigmas for this cycle, or at least have them available to us in November to make that decision, and then hopefully we can schedule a review of this new-ish 2003 modified sigma methodology. Maybe it's the better way to go. I don't know what the implications are going to be, but I would like to understand some of the math and put it in a spreadsheet, et cetera. And I think that's all I've got for this.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:29] Thank you Lynn. Any questions for clarification on the motion? No clarification questions. Discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:31:43] Thanks Lynn. Thanks for putting this together. A couple, a few quick comments. Yeah, I thought it was kind of funny that no one mentioned the yelloweye in our overview comments so thank you for speaking to that. Also no one asked the question about California quillback during the information session in our....I forget who said it but yeah, it didn't make sense. People spend more time on things that are going to impact them more. But yeah, very, very good news about yelloweye, but hearing Lynn's, like let's talk about that and how we approach it later on this week. The other thought I just wanted to note, again, thank everyone who worked on the risk tables. Thanks a lot to Council staff, Marlene. I saw how you really helped make that happen. If we were back up on the table you would see that instead of 0.5, I think it was for sablefish and chilipepper, that would be cut in half to 0.25 had we really used them this time. And so, but I think we'll be talking in meeting planning about where we talked about it and review how it went and see if we want to keep going. Appreciate the comments from the EAS and EWG and it looks like the GAP and GMT didn't have time to discuss, but I just wanted to note, yeah, that could have made a difference here. And on the.....oh, the time-varying sigma, last comment. I think, again, I think this whole Council, all of us need to understand what that means better. Personally I don't have a problem implementing it now, but I think there is the benefit to educating everyone more on what that is, but like I said in the opening, they're telling us that these assessments, their accuracy, to start off with is pretty....it's.....we have good people, good data, good methods, but you got a wide range of uncertainty here and then it gets worse over time and it's riskier for stocks where they die off quicker. So I'm agreeing that more discussion would be useful and I hope we have the bigger discussion about risk and sigma as well. So thanks again Lynn for putting this together. We'll be supporting it of course.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:59] Other discussion? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:34:02] Thank you Chair Hassemer. As to yelloweye, I'd just like to say that it's been off the overfished list for a long time, it's just been rebuilt. So I just, I point that out. So that's probably why we're not as effusive as we probably should be. But anyway, thank you for the motion Lynn. Really good. I support it.

Pete Hassemer [00:34:26] Other discussion? I'm not seeing any I will call the question then. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:34:39] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:34:39] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. With that, because that was the only task listed, I will first turn to Marlene to see if there's anything else we need to do, but before I do that, Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:34:58] I'm sorry, I really need to write down these thoughts before I go, but I think the

other one is just I hope on the yellowtail and the GAPs request to the supple.....I don't think anyone spoke to that, but I think we're going to talk about that in constructive ways in this next agenda item, but I just wanted to make sure that we did hear what they're saying and I think everyone's hearing like let's address these, but I think the next, in the next agenda item is where to start doing that. Thank you for indulging another comment there.

Pete Hassemer [00:35:25] All right, thanks. Marlene.

Marlene Bellman [00:35:31] Thank you Chair Hassemer now. Thanks to the Council. You have adopted the bulk of the stock assessment work and also provided some guidance to us on moving forward with the supplemental review as well as bringing back, making sure we have all the harvest specifications available in November. And again, a very robust discussion. Very much appreciated. And I think you've completed the task for this item. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:36:02] All right, and with that I just want to make sure there's no other closing comments anybody has to make here? I'm not seeing any, we'll close out this agenda item.

4. Stock Assessment Methodology Topic Selection-Final Topics

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes the reports and public comment, takes us to our Council task which should be flashing up before our eyes. And that is adopt methodology review topics for review in 2026. Who would like to start the discussion on this item? I'm not sure which side to focus on. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:00:33] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair, and thanks to the Science Center and SSC, GAP, and Heather, thank for giving those thoughts off the top of your head, they were very helpful. Yeah I guess, and I'm thinking back to what we just talked about in G.3 and going back to Keeley's idea of specific....I heard a germ have an idea and I think we should be all supportive of adopting this methodology topic, but my question is how do we make it the learning exchange beyond just the review of the hyperstability parameter type thing? So I don't.....I guess that's what we're here to do, but put Council staff on the spot that how we might plan out for something like that?

Pete Hassemer [00:01:25] Let me call on Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:01:29] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and appreciate the question Mr. Niles. We've been thinking quite a bit about this too. You'll recall, and you may have even noticed as part of this meeting we have a consultant right now that's taking an evaluation of our stock assessment process, not the modeling that the Science Center does, but our process, and I think what you're raising and what others have raised fits into that, which is how do we create an exchange where there's better understanding, maybe there's better information flow that ultimately helps support a better product. So I would suggest that we wait to see the result of that consultant's analysis that'll be made available to you in March, and then from there we can start to outline the next steps in our process about what sorts of improvements we might want to make, including some of the questions that you've just posed.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:30] Thank you. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:02:30] Thanks Mr. Chair, and thanks Merrick for the reminder. And so what I'm hearing is, and I forget the exact timeline on the results of that, but we could say we could adopt this topic with expectation that there'll be opportunity to plan around, around that sometime in the not-too-distant future, so the timelines....okay, so thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:00] Other discussion? My guess is this is going to take a motion. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:03:11] Yeah I do....well when we talked about volunteering for motions I volunteered to do this one but I, it's easy, I didn't write it up yet, but, so I didn't do my homework, but I could do it pretty easily orally if that works.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:31] Let's take a shot at that. Remember, take your time going through it. Follow on the screen so they capture that.

Corey Niles [00:03:41] Okay, thank you Mr. Chair. I move that the Council adopt the methodology review topic recommended by the SSC in their report under this agenda item.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:07] And I suspect maybe we can get the specific report reference in there. G.4.a, SSC Report 1, is that the one you're referring to Corey?

Corey Niles [00:04:24] Yes Mr. Chair. Excuse me.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:31] All right, I'll give you a chance go look at that. Does that language appear accurate and complete?

Corey Niles [00:04:37] It does.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:39] Okay, thank you. Is there a second to that? Just one moment before we get a second. Marlene, did you have something there?

Marlene Bellman [00:04:57] Just for technical clarification, it's G.4.a, Supplemental SSC Report 1.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:05] Thank you. Technical correction.

Marlene Bellman [00:05:07] Yeah, grammatical correction. I move that the Council adopt the methodology review topic recommended, is that accurate?

Corey Niles [00:05:16] Yes.

Marlene Bellman [00:05:20] Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:20] Corey, it's your motion. That looks correct now?

Corey Niles [00:05:23] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:26] All right. Is there a second? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Please speak to your motion.

Corey Niles [00:05:30] Yeah, I don't think we need to speak long. Thanks to the Science Center for putting forward the idea and SSC discussing it and the GAP supporting it. But I do, I would point to the exchange I just had with Executive Director Burden about this is just kind of one step in planning for....it's kind of a narrow technical review by the SSC but will be part of a bigger dialogue that will follow from what we've learned this cycle, what we learned from the consultant report and to be planned in the future.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:07] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? No questions, any discussion on the motion? There are no hands. I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:06:24] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:27] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Corey. Again, before we close out I'll look around for any comments, but I just want to make....check-in with Marlene how we're doing here?

Marlene Bellman [00:06:46] Thank you Chair Hassemer. The Council has selected a topic for groundfish methodology review and we will go forward with that guidance. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:55] All right, thank you. Any other closing comments need to be made here? Seeing no hands I will close out this agenda item. Thank you for your quick work on that.

5. Trawl Catch Share Program Review-Preliminary

Butch Smith [00:00:00] So that will end public comment and we will enter into Council discussion. I think our, one of our goals, yep, there it is right there, to come up with some, maybe some written guidance I believe was what I heard. But Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:27] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I don't want to stifle the discussion but I do have a suggestion for some written guidance if the tower of power could put that up.

Butch Smith [00:00:36] Well sometimes written guidance stimulates discussion, so I don't think in this case it's such a bad thing unless the Council thinks that that's a wrong move. Go ahead, please.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:56] Okay, thank you. Just in case you forgot how to read during lunch. I guess the procedure is for me to read this out loud. Staff and consultants should continue drafting the Trawl Cost Share Program Review, taking into account the comments raised by the Council as well as the advisory bodies at the September 2025 Council meeting. In particular, the final version should identify the key drivers behind the variable and overall declining trends in economic performance of the catch shares program. Consider recommendations contained in G.5.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, and G.5.a, Supplemental GMT Report 1. The final review report should be submitted in time for the briefing book for the November 2025 Pacific Fishery Management Council Meeting. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:01:38] Thank you. So discussion on that or just discussion? It's Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:01:50] Thank you Vice-Chair. I would call this a question more than anything, and thank you for this written guidance Dr. Lent. What I'm assuming, and I want to see if you have the same assumption, as I read your second paragraph, apparently I lost my brain over lunch, the second piece of the guidance, consider the recommendations, in those reports, right, there is a lot of recommendations, a lot really good recommendations, and I'm thinking about our time clock, I think it's about a month, perhaps less, before the advanced briefing book for November. So what I see implicitly in there is some prioritization and I think you have that there, right, with just consider the recommendations. I'm expecting they'll go through as many as possible but probably unable to make it through everything, is that your expectation with sort of where we are in the calendar and how quick the November meeting is coming?

Butch Smith [00:02:51] Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:02:51] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thank you Miss Kent. Yeah, definitely there's a lot in there. Some of those lists are things that are the next steps, so this really be what's going into the report. I think through our discussions here on the floor we pretty much raised some of the things that are of top priority, but I think in general the GAP and the GMT discussions reflect those recommendations. So definitely can't do it all in a month especially, but hopefully the priority areas we've heard on the Council floor and from the comments as well. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:03:30] Thank you. Anyone else? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:03:35] Thanks Mr. Vice-Chair. I think that's a good point. That's kind of what was in my mind of, yeah, I really appreciate all the work. Really, I was really pleased would be the word to see all the attention the GAP gave to this and to the EDC data. But I think the frustration we've had,

and I think I voiced this last time is this, we're doing all this when we could be actually working on the fixes, so I think that's the important part to get to. And in the future when we do this I hope we could.....and like Aja talked about the continuous improvement idea that we talked about yesterday, and we can just do that, and so I'm thinking of ways to improve. We need to align all these, all these resources that are spent on this review with the analysis that will help us make the changes more directly. And the first time we did this we had a full on team of economists who did the review and then when it came time to doing the changes it was probably cut in half, if not more than that, for the number of staff able to work on it. So with that, thank you for the guidance. It very much reflects what we've been thinking. And just one last thought as I.....yeah, I was here at the beginning too and one of my favorite memories was, I can't remember Heather if it was a Groundfish Allocation Committee or in the Council where people were looking at tables and the report didn't have page numbers and you made everyone take out their pencils and number the pages themselves so they would stop.....but yeah, so yeah, looking forward to getting to the next stage. Thanks for everyone for all the good work that went into this so far.

Butch Smith [00:05:27] Thank you Mr. Niles. Miss Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:05:32] Thank you Vice-Chair. I had the opportunity to listen and participate in four of the five hearings we had in April and July. I wasn't able to go to the one in California, but the ones in Oregon and online, and Miss Waller was very receptive to edits to her presentation and the information she showed and came back with as quickly as she could, so really wanted to appreciate the work that Jessi did as well as all the people who participated in those hearings and provided their input. Going to yet another meeting in the evening or during the day online is not always fun, but hearing from the fishery participants themselves was very valuable to get their firsthand experience with the program and what's working and what's maybe not working. So mostly just a thank you, and additionally to Dr. Lent for providing the guidance.

Butch Smith [00:06:29] Thank you Lynn. Anyone else? Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:06:35] Thank you. Just echoing all of the same things that were just offered to the industry participants and to everyone who did all the work to put together this big report. And then I just want to reemphasize, like, I think everyone's anxious to get going and so. But yeah, I do want to....I know that the things, you know, the careful thought that the GAP put into the, to their report was to better reflect information that they think is important to characterizing what is actually happening in the fishery so that we can appropriately address it in our follow-on action. So I see, I definitely get that balance. I'm like as.....I'm ready to go too. I want to do stuff as well, but I also want us to make sure that we can really.....I don't want to change things without the information that the GAP asked for so that we're backing up the things that they're asking for us to change in exactly the right way. So I'm hopeful there's like a good balance between adding in that additional information and then us getting going on things. And then I, yeah I do see a lot of promise, and I'll talk about this later today when we get to the emergency action as well, but I see a lot of promise in some of the things that we're ready that we've already gotten underway as a Council body to help address things in the groundfish fishery to start getting these things going so there is.....I'm trying to take some comfort in the fact that there are problems that we have already identified that we are starting to rush towards fixing too. So thank you everyone, and thank you Dr. Lent for the guidance that you provided.

Butch Smith [00:08:20] Mr. Brad Pettinger please.

Brad Pettinger [00:08:22] Thank you Vice-Chair Smith. You know there's a lot of, a lot here and it's not necessarily one thing. There's a lot of things that need to be worked on and some things are within the Council arena and some of things aren't. I think the GMT Report talks about the performance of

fishery and the performance of the management system, kind of like I think.....the management system works great for conserving stocks, as in not catching, and I think that, I think we're constrained a lot of ways that we wish we had the flexibility but we don't. And I think that certainly a catch-up date we talked about doing is going to help for next year if that goes through. But realistically we shouldn't have to do all that work to get there. I mean the National Standard Guideline 1 kind of sticks us in this 12 month blocks, and I think that's a bigger issue outside of this arena, but that's something that needs to be addressed because if you think about with all the stressors on the folks investing in the infrastructure in these ports, these processors, they have to have some surety that they're going to get their money back. And that's one thing we haven't given is people some stability, and I think that's where we've really failed across the board is we just we haven't given that and so only if someone's given a bunch of money and they're an idiot is going to want to enter into this fishery and invest into it if they don't have some stability that they'll get their money back. And I think that's what we need to do is how are we going to add stability to this process? Because without that you don't have investment, that's the bottom line. And so the fishermen are here because they got no place else to go. Those boats don't make very good ski boats. They don't make for very good charter boats. I mean, we have investment and we're here for long term because there's no place to go. And we talk about new entries into this fishery. Why in the hell would you want to get involved in this fishery with the instability that we have? And I think we're working on it, I think we're doing, we're doing good work. Don't get me wrong, I think....but we have constraints on us outside of here that we need to work on. If we had a big sea carryover, just like I had a little talk, I think, on the Council floor last meeting, we could roll over unused quota that's already been declared dead in the catch streams, we wouldn't hardly.....we wouldn't have to do any updates because we'd automatically get that fish moved forward anyway, and the impacts to that downturn would hardly be felt because no one's trying to catch all the canary. The canary is there by golly just to catch the rest of the stuff, it's not a target species. And so I think there's things we, there's things that we need to be done in this arena. There's other things outside this arena that need to take care of, but I think that in my mind we need a build stability into West Coast groundfish fisheries across the board. So anyway, great report. Good work done, Rebecca. Thank you for your, the motion here or the guidance, I think, in front of us, good stuff. You know we'll keep keep marching forward and hopefully good things will happen. So thank you.

Butch Smith [00:11:54] Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:11:56] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair, and thanks for all those comments. Just a little wrap-up here. We spend a lot of time, money, resources on stock assessments. We're measuring all the time how much fish is out there, how much we're catching, how much we're discarding, and we regularly have updates. There's some really interesting and important work going on in the social sciences. I'd appreciate getting thorough updates more often than once every five to seven years. I know those reports are there, but let's make sure that when the Science Center Directors come in and give their reports, that we say, hey, and here's what's going on with the social sciences teams and here's the latest trends, here's the last report and read them the same way we read the stock assessment. If we have to do the social sciences-at-a-glance, let's do that. What are the top statistics? How's it going? Is it stable? Is it varying? And I really appreciate this opportunity at this meeting to bring the economics to the fore in social sciences because frankly that's where we have the most problems to solve, and I think it'd be helpful for us to have a steady diet of this at least on an annual basis. So that's my pitch and I thank you for that. And I thank the Science Centers, NMFS, and the Council for everything that they're doing to keep us informed. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:13:12] Mr. Executive Director.

Merrick Burden [00:13:15] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice Chairman, and thank you Dr. Lent for introducing this guidance. Just some comments here in response to some of the comments that you all

have made around this table. We have really two parts here. So one is, as I look ahead to what the final product would be, we have the sort of typical and traditional catch share review document, and we've added this section where we've said, can we diagnose why the program hasn't worked in the way that we hoped it would and maybe even thought that it would. And as I think about what that does for us, it's really starting to help us with scoping the next step. And so I've always thought that the best scoping exercise gets us really clear on why we would move forward before we do anything, and so that's what that's trying to do. It's saying, you all have indicated that you're uncomfortable with the economic performance, and you'd understand why that's happening so that we can tee up the next action. And I think that maybe relates to some of the comments I've heard from a few people here around the table. So I'll offer that for what it's worth.

Butch Smith [00:14:28] Mr. Niles.

Corey Niles [00:14:30] Just quickly, we want to get on with the day, but the counterpoint to that is we know that we went through gear switching we knew, we diagnosed what the issues were. We know the GAP has told us time and time again what the lightning strikes are an issue. We know that from processors that the costs are.....so yeah, I think there's a balance to be had, but yeah I really appreciate it Merrick. I just wanted to make that point. We know, and there's the issue about the quota share, how active people are on the fish that we've seen some of these things rise and we could, again in the future, maybe even do even a better balance, but I do really.. I agree with you what you say about diagnosing the issue, just we've been doing a lot of diagnosing as we've gone.

Butch Smith [00:15:22] And I heard it a couple of times that we mustn't forget all we do here, and remember what we do, but you know when boats have to tie up their expenses don't stop. And when processors shut down, depending on the size, you know it's.....Safe Co Seafoods in Ilwaco's about a $35,000 bill a month just sitting dormant at least. And I'm sure the bigger ones like Ocean Gold are pressing a lot more than that, and so it's real important to keep fisheries going throughout the year, and I heard that in the testimony from either Lori or Heather or maybe all. So anyway, any more on this? So Miss Jessi I'm looking at you to see if we have done our business here to your satisfaction or do we need to do more or what do you think?

Jessi Waller [00:16:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair and Council Members. Yes, I think you've completed your action for today. Really appreciate the feedback, written guidance provided by Dr. Lent. Myself and the analytical team will take this back and see what we can do in the next, I think four weeks before the November briefing book deadline with, you know, making the....considering the recommendations of the GAP and GMT and then working on that diagnosis piece to come back in November. So I think you've completed your action for today.

Butch Smith [00:17:05] Thank you. Okay so I think we are, I think I am giving the gavel back to Chairman Hassemer and good luck.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:28] Be careful, I may pass it back.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That brings us to our Council action. Three tasks listed there. I believe because this is adoption it will require motions at some point. So with that pause who wants to start the discussion here? Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:00:24] Thank you Chair. And I wish I had as much energy this afternoon as Miss Nayani does. Yesterday there was some talk that we should be celebrating a little bit that we have yelloweye rockfish rebuilt. Yes, but it's by just a hair, so I appreciate the GAP and the GMT recommending some precautionary approaches to how we move forward, whether we do that through harvest specifications or the management measures. I think there is a fine line of being precautionary until we get a full assessment, but also we need to allow some retention so we can get some data to inform that full assessment. Currently the only ages that are going into that survey or that assessment are from the IPHC survey, which is getting a little hit and miss location-wise and year-wise from IPHC and from confiscations from OSP and probably maybe WDFW enforcement and CDFW enforcement as well. I don't know where that sweet spot is yet and how we would get there, but I appreciate the trying to be a little bit precautionary as we go forward there. I think there's really good justification for some alternative Harvest Control Rules by both the GAP and the GMT as we look going forward and that both groups have been heeding the guidance we've been getting from our NMFS West Coast Region colleagues about NOAA management measures. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:56] Thank you. Other discussion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:01:59] Yeah, thanks Lynn. I just...on the yelloweye, agree and just I think and just want to continue with the theme of the week and Brad's box of chocolates and sigma is that it's not just that it's a smidge over in my mind, its, as one of our stakeholders, I forget which one it was, reminded canary when the assessment that said it was rebuilt, said the stock had rebuilt back in 2007, which is when the restrictions were probably tightest at the time and then the assessment, the latest assessment said that it never reached the target. So it's really, I think it's not just the smidge part, it's this fluctuation part. And I really want to emphasize what you said about the data collection and getting more data collection. So yeah, just repeating what Lynn said but just making points of emphasis and agreeing with her and all those who she was mentioning, the GAP, GMT, et cetera.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:07] Any other discussion? Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:03:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a quick comment that nothing makes me more happy than to see the Action Item Checklist at the beginning of spex, so thank you to GMT. I like the organization. Lynn I took your comment very seriously that it is difficult to grapple with the number of species coming in with modifications at a very late hour. That being said, I'm very grateful that the SSC is taking an early look now and that these things are being caught in September rather than in later meetings and feel pretty confident that we have a little bit more time to evaluate those before November, so I think I'm comfortable kicking most of those to November to give a little bit more look-see from everybody, including the GMT and the GAP and public. And then just a comment on the alternative Harvest Control Rules. I'm comfortable with what's been put forward right now. I'm cautiously optimistic about yelloweye. I think that it's a good celebratory step. As you can see it's taking California considerable more precaution to take a step out on cowcod, but I think given where both the default and the alternative Harvest Control Rules are put forward right now, I think that's maybe worthy of some very, very light preliminary looks at what increasing those numbers for discard and science collection could give us, and that's always beneficial. And then I guess lastly, I just want to thank the GAP and GMT again for going through and putting forward this first crack at routine management measures. It's

always helpful to have a starting place for the GMT to discuss in October, but it's even more helpful for respective state agencies to start thinking about what we're going to analyze and how we're going to start maneuvering, so I really appreciate that. Anyway, that's just initial thoughts.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:13] Thank you. Other discussion? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:05:22] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. You know the yelloweye, I feel pretty good with the numbers. I mean trawl vessels that fish up and down the coast and anytime you go to any ground that's remotely hard, not rocky, just a little harder, you hit yelloweye, and so I think I feel pretty good about where we're at. If you look at the assessment, you know we weren't, we barely went into overfished status if you look at the assessment, the latest numbers. And so, and it's been actually above the overfished level for over 20 years so we weren't just rebuilt. We were rebuilt. We just didn't get off the overfished list here recently. So I have to conclude it's important to keep in context where we're at here so we have a requirement to rebuild the 40%. I do like the GAPs option of going down to a 300 ton ACL for the roughspot, rougheye. That's a pretty long lived fish and I don't think we should be pushing anything on that species in creating a fishery potentially. And I just, I'm really glad that they had that in there because it's just, the return isn't near what it would be if the clock to rebuild that stock would be far longer than I'll be on this earth. So anyway, good stuff.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:00] Thank you. Anything else? Discussion? Not seeing discussion, Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:12] Thank you Chair. Not seeing any other hands going up. It doesn't seem like there's discussion yet. I do have a motion ready to I think address Items 1 and 2 on our task list if you're ready.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:27] We are ready for it.

Lynn Mattes [00:07:37] Thank you for making it bigger for my middle-aged eyes to be able to read it. And this one I couldn't figure out a way to make it into smaller elephant bites, so this one's a pretty big-size elephant bite. I move the Council conditionally adopt the 2027-2028 overfishing limits or OFLs, stock categories, and P-Star values presented in Agenda Item G.6, Supplemental Attachment 1, and Table 2 in Agenda Item G.6, Supplemental Revised Attachment 2. And the updates from Agenda Item G.6.a, Supplemental SSC Report, except for chilipepper, bocaccio, and black rockfish off of Oregon. For those three species request OFLs be calculated using the original time-varying sigma and brought back to the November 2025 meeting. Default Harvest Control Rules for the species in the following table. Quillback rockfish off California, sablefish, petrale sole, and darkblotched rockfish. For all of those ABC equals ACL with a P-star of 0.45. In addition, request projections associated with the alternative Harvest Control Rules presented below as recommended by the GMT, Agenda Item G.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report 3. And to the GAP in Agenda Item G.6.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1 prior to the November Council meeting to further inform adoption of a range of alternative Harvest Control Rules at that time. For yellowtail rockfish: Alternative 1 at a phased-in approach for this next biennium. Chilipepper rockfish: Constant ACL of 2,114 metric tons. For rougheye rockfish: Alternative 1, a constant ACL equal 519 metric tons, and Alternative 2, a constant ACL of 300 metric tons. For yelloweye rockfish: A constant ACL of 85 metric tons. For canary rockfish: ABC equals ACL, P-Star of 0.45 with no 40° 10' adjustment. For shortspine thornyhead: A constant ABC equals ACL of 902 metric tons. And for petrale sole: A constant ABC equals ACL of 2,489 metric tons if there's an emergency rule for 2026, and 2,501 metric tons if no emergency rule. Widow rockfish is not included in this motion as a stock assessment has not yet been approved and adopted. That information is anticipated to be available in November. If you can scroll down there's one more sentence. Thank you. The Council will confirm or update the values associated with these control rules after receiving results

of the SSC review of all values in November 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:48] Thank you Lynn. As I followed along that all looked accurate and complete, but let me check with Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:10:54] Oh, excuse me. Thank you Mr. Chair. I was going to ask Miss Mattes a question but please, if I may?

Pete Hassemer [00:11:00] Yes.

Todd Phillips [00:11:04] Kris could you scroll up to the table, please? Thank you. So Miss Mattes, my question to you is that make sure that we are under a similar understanding is that with the term, "constant ACL" and "ad hoc phase-in" that those would be just for the next biennium and then post that it would restore to the default Harvest Control Rule? Thank you.

Lynn Mattes [00:11:27] Through the Chair, Mr. Phillips, I was going to call you Mr. Todd. Mr. Philips that is correct. I did not, I forgot a little piece. Alternative 1 references what's in the GMT Report as recommendations and Alternative 2 is the difference in the GAP. But yes, those are meant just for this next biennium.

Todd Phillips [00:11:53] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:53] All right, with that I gather there was no change necessary there. It's all accurate and complete. Do you agree?

Lynn Mattes [00:12:00] Yes sir, it was just clarification of intent.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:02] Okay.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:02] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:03] Is there a second on the motion? Seconded by Caroline McKnight. Please speak to your motion.

Lynn Mattes [00:12:12] Thank you Chair Hassemer. This goes along with the information we've received from our stock assessments from the SSC, the GAP, and the GMT on things we can adopt now. With widow rockfish going to what used to be called mop-up to the supplemental review we don't have information yet on widow rockfish so we can't adopt anything at this time. Additionally, based on our discussions yesterday about the two different methods for time-varying sigma and the fact that we don't think that's quite ready for prime time, requesting that we get runs with the standard or the previous time-variant sigma to use as we go forward. The species in the first table are species that were assessed this summer? Spring? Spring and summer, and just adding the defaults. And then the second table again is the combination of the GMT and GAP recommendations to look at some alternative Harvest Control Rules. As we move forward past November we may limit, may reduce that range of alternatives, but hopefully this gives the GMT some things to look at as they go through their October work session. And then what is being proposed here is the rates, and then hopefully in November what we will get will be the actual numbers. So we're just adopting the rates, or the rules, and then a bunch of math will be done between now and November. And then in November we'll have the tables with the actual number for the ABCs, or the ACLs. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:57] Thank you Lynn. Questions for the maker of the motion for clarification?

Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:14:08] Thank you. Thank you Miss Mattes for the motion. I think this is an easy one and it relates to how we think about doing the spex under NEPA. So when I'm looking at that table of the range of alternative Harvest Control Rules, just sort of clarifying that as we look at spex the No-Action Alternative will be what is in place now. Action Alternative 1 is actually the default Harvest Control Rules, and so then your Alternative 1 column will become Alternative 2, Alternative 2 column will become Alternative 3. These are all the details, right, that we sort of work out as we start setting up the NEPA process, so I don't see a problem here, but I just wanted to just sort of make sure that's clear for you. It's just an annoying NEPA detail.

Lynn Mattes [00:14:56] Through the Chair, thank you Miss Kent. I had tried to block that part of the NEPA analysis in these tables out of my brain. But yes, with the understanding that these are actually three alternatives in addition to no action, and it's still better than one year we had seven POP alternatives to analyze, which was a nightmare. But I really appreciate the clarification and hopefully that clarifies this for some others who maybe aren't as familiar with the spex process as Miss Kent and I are.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:27] Any other questions? No questions. Any discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:15:43] Thank you Lynn for the motion and all those who helped with it, lots of details. Just one quick comment on, yeah, on I think Brad said it and then Lynn spoke to it, but just on the thinking about some of these alternatives on the control rules, just canary as an example and this issue about where we have about the GMT Report about where were not having full attainment is the P-Star decision as important because we're going to come in under the ACL, the P-Star is almost moot. And I think there's a paper by Will Satterthwaite that people may have seen where ideally the things would line up. You want to think about your ABC risks, not just based on the P-Star, but on what you expect to be harvested. So just wanted to call attention to that, and yeah, thank everyone for all the good thought, and Lynn, Heather, and everyone else who put all these details together, and staff of course, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:40] Thank you Corey. Any other discussion? Not seeing any hands then I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:16:56] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:57] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Lynn. And back here, so you said that attacked tasks 1 and 2 there. The other side of the table, Caroline McKnight.

Caroline McKnight [00:17:24] Not to cut any other discussion off too early, but I am prepared with a motion to address Number 3.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:30] Yes, let's go ahead.

Caroline McKnight [00:17:40] Thank you. I move the Council adopt for public review the preliminary range of management measures identified in G.6.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, September 2025, and as outlined in Table 4 from Agenda Item G.6.a, Supplemental GMT Report 3, September 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:00] That language on the screen appears accurate and complete?

Caroline McKnight [00:18:02] It does.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:03] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

Caroline McKnight [00:18:09] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yeah, so these are the first set of measures put forward both by our GMT and our GAP. These are intended to help us in 27' and 28' achieve but not exceed our harvest specifications that we're also working on adopting. I'll just touch on a few here. I will note that in Table 4, the GMT Report relative to Action Item 3 and 6, canary rockfish, it says, "pending Council guidance". The intent here is for what I heard from Mr. Niles was that there will be some more information forthcoming in November about some more specifics, but that does also leave some room for the GMT to discuss in October the GAP recommendation, which is to talk about some flexibility measures relative to canary. So just to provide that clear guidance what this motion is meant to cover. Again, the others are all covered by the GMT and GAP as recommended and I think I'll leave it there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:20] Thank you. Questions regarding the motion? Seeing no questions, any discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:19:34] Thank you Caroline, thanks for the motion, and again to the GAP and GMT and staff for being so organized. Just on the, thank you Caroline for mentioning the canary idea and I think we had some discussion in the Q&A and I think I was going to offer guidance or a motion, but I think you covered it. It's really just let's think about how we can maybe plan the spex a little bit differently but while thinking what else might be taken up under the harvest specifications and hopefully that's enough of guidance to start thinking more in November. But I just wanted to call that out but a small piece in this big package that are not as big as we've seen I guess, but a lot more covered in the package. But yeah, thank you for the motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:19] Any other discussion? Not seeing any, call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:20:27] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:30] Opposed? Abstentions? That motion passes unanimously. Thank you Caroline. I'm not cutting off any discussion yet but our task list is there. This seemed too easy so I want to check-in with Todd.

Todd Phillips [00:20:49] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Yes it does seem oddly easy. So listening in and to the discussion as well as the motions, the Council has addressed the first task, the second task, as well the third task. I think we have enough, at least in terms of the management measures to move forward with their GMT October meeting and we are thankful for that information. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:16] All right, thank you. Now I'll look around and see if there's anything else to be added? Discussion? Comments? And not seeing any then I take it we are completed with this agenda item. We'll close it out.

7. Inseason Adjustments-Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] And look around and see who wants to start discussion on this agenda item. The task list is there, adopting any inseason adjustments as necessary and some other considerations. Any hands? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:22] Thank you Mr. Chair. I am ready with a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:26] Let's hear it.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:27] Alrighty. Thank you tower. I move the Council adopt the following inseason actions as recommended by the GAP in Agenda Item G.7.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1, and GMT Agenda Item G.7.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1. Oh, that should be GMT Report 1. Thank you. Primary sablefish tier fishery. Increase the incidental Pacific halibut landing limit from 75 pounds to 100 pounds of Pacific halibut for every 1,000 pounds of sablefish plus two additional halibut. For California recreational, modify bag limits to establish a two-fish sub-bag limit for canary rockfish off California.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:28] That language on the screen looks accurate and complete?

Marci Yaremko [00:01:32] Yes it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:33] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Jaime Diamond. Please speak to your motion.

Marci Yaremko [00:01:38] I think the GAP and GMT Reports do a fine job of describing the need for the action. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:45] All right, any questions for clarification regarding the motion? Seeing no questions, discussion on the motion? Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:02:01] Just quickly, thanks Marci and yeah, agreeing that it's the GMT, GAP that spoke to it and on the sablefish part we keep close eye on that. But just going back to some things Aja and the if-then we talked about yesterday, just wondering could we have done this more economically offline as kind of just a connection between agenda items here, but appreciating the motion and all the work that made this discussion easy.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:33] Any other discussion? Seeing no hands I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:02:46] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:46] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Marci. Look back at our tasks, and again, not cutting off discussion but.....anything else to consider on catch projections? Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:03:11] Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to follow-up on Corey's comment, I guess I would just offer that regarding halibut inseason actions with regard to the incidental limits in the salmon troll fishery, there's another example where we do have the ability to take inseason action out of a Council meeting via a call using the salmon inseason process. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:39] Okay, and remember as we look at our task list there, number 3 has been moved forward to the next agenda item. Todd, what have you heard?

Todd Phillips [00:03:47] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Looking at your Council task list, item 1 and 2, you have considered the groundfish catch and projections and you have requested or recommended two inseason adjustments. I would say based on that, your tasks are complete for this item.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:03] All right, thank you. Any other last comments, discussion? Not seeing any we'll close out that agenda item. Let's take a 10 minute break here and get ready to come back for our last agenda item of the day.

8. Emergency Action: Revised 2026 Specifications and Measures for Canary Rockfish, Shortspine Thornyhead, and Petrale Sole - Final Action

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] So I think with that we will move on then, close the public comment and take us into our Council action here. And quickly review the task list, consider whether or not this meets the emergency rule criteria, consider the revised harvest specifications for 2026, and confirm any revised management measures for 2026. Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:00:37] Thank you Chair. Before we get into discussion I just wanted to say quickly, I just want to thank the Northwest Fisheries Science Center folks for taking on these additional catch-only projections. This is an added work to what we're already doing then that the Council requested back in June, so I wanted to recognize that. That extra work has given the Council something to consider taking action on today so I wanted recognize that. I also want to recognize that certainly over several meetings now there's been a very organized industry response on this issue, on these issues, and a really big effort on that information gathering that's been really helpful, I think, in propelling us along what can we do, and so I appreciate that effort. I know that that is extra added effort on top of all of the effort that is running a business, being out on the water, and everything that goes into that, so I appreciate that. I also want to recognize the moving an emergency action onto the Council's agenda creates sort of additional quick work, and I want to appreciate the staff effort just in the last couple of days to put together documentation for the Council to consider the SSC's work on reviewing these catch-only projections that are new and different from what we've done before, the GMT work, the GAP Report, those are really helpful, I think, in the Council considering what to do here. So before we got into discussion I just wanted to recognize all that.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:11] Thank you, appreciate that. Other discussion? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:20] Thank you Chair. I don't want to cut off discussion, but I do have a motion when folks are ready for it.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:26] I will look once more if there's any initial discussion to be had. Heather Mann. Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:02:35] Thank you....(laughter).....there's two Heathers in the room today. Yeah, thank you Chair, and thank you for all of the really good work that the GMT and the GAP put into their reports on this. And I know we're talking about an emergency rule for 2026, but all of the rationale and the information that's in these reports is, I think, really helpful for us to think about as we move forward in this spex management process, as we talk about flexible management through spex flex and all sorts of things. I just think it's going to be important resources for us to think about as we go through the next few months, well more than six months. But I also wanted to comment on the Washington recreational fishery. We have actually exceeded our harvest guideline for canary rockfish this year, so not underachieving but overachieving, and we do need more and we will in 2026. And some of the same things that are happening in the trawl sectors are happening in the recreational sectors as we have the lingcod closure at Leadbetter Point that is in place. That's in place to avoid canary rockfish and yelloweye rockfish. And I know our recreational fleet is aware of their harvest guideline and adjusting where they're fishing to not exceed it. So just wanted to share that, and again, appreciate all the information in these reports. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:25] All right, thank you. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:04:28] Thank you Chair. I want to echo the thanks to the GMT and staff. And I know

I, I think I mentioned this under open comment and I've said it during delegation, the Oregon delegation meeting, really appreciate trying to come in with solutions, not just coming with a problem but really working to try to find a solution moving forward. This action has the potential to benefit most of our sectors. I know Lori was kind of referring to him earlier, but I remember Rod Moore back when we were at like the 48 metric ton ACL for canary, every fish counts, and every little bit of fish counts on these for us right now. While it may not appear that some sectors are going over, individual vessels are being impacted. There's a lot of things behind those numbers that are important to consider. This also, I think, does kind of lead into some of our spex flex, harvest specifications flexibility. I've been referring to this as sort of a modified green light. And maybe this, we can't set something up ahead of time and then call it an emergency, but maybe this helps us set up some ways that in the future we can react a little more responsively. So appreciate the work that's gone into this and the creative solution finding. That's not a right sentence, but I think you all get what I'm after. But yeah, just thanks for all the work on this.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:09] Thank you. Any other general comments? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:06:15] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. Yeah, I think this is really great that the agency has on a abbreviated staff stepped up and they heard the Council and did it, and hats off to them and also all the good work that the, from industry to get us where we're at. I just did a rough calculation, it's well over a million dollars, it's just a trawl X vessel, but there's also the multiplier, right? Because these fish come with other fish and so it's actually a pretty big footprint from what you see just beyond these numbers here so we shouldn't forget that. So anyway, just really appreciate the effort that went into it when there was limited resources. So anyway, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:02] Thank you. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:05] Yeah, this has been noted before but it really stands out to me as being super important. We have so many comments from across all states and all sectors in the record, both under open comment and here today. It's really, I think, unique that we have such unanimous, unconditioned support that will relieve multiple different choke points that each constrain operations in different ways but collectively will provide relief coastwide. So I thought that was very, it's kind of unique in actions that we consider so just appreciate that. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:49] Thank you Marci. I'm not seeing any other hands then I'm going to look back to Aja Szumylo for your motion.

Aja Szumylo [00:08:01] Thank you. Okay, so I move that the Council request that NOAA Fisheries initiate an emergency rule to implement the revised catch limits for canary rockfish, shortspine thornyhead, and petrale sole, with proportional increases for all fishing sectors detailed in Tables 1 through 3 in Agenda Item G.8.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1. The Council recommends implementing this rule as soon as possible to allow for planning for the 2026 fishing year.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:30] Thank you Aja. I followed along. The language on the screen appears accurate and complete? Thank you. Is there a second to your motion? Seconded by Heather Hall. Please speak to your motion.

Aja Szumylo [00:08:44] Thank you, and I'm going to say a lot of things that have already been said. But I'd like to first, again, reiterate the thanks to everyone who played a part in putting aside other work to do the work to create the underpinning for this emergency. Again, starting with the Science Center and their work on the catch-only projections and shoehorning that into a lot of other workload that they had already, the Region, all of the advisory bodies, and then the organization on the industry side to get

consensus around an approach. These three species, as everyone said, are important to all groundfish sectors and all three of our coastal states, and the combined reductions for 2026 and the ones that would have, or yeah, the 2025 and the ones that would've been in place for 2026 have created significant challenges across the fishery. This emergency is necessary because of the unforeseen magnitude of the impacts of the combined decreases that the 2025 quota reductions had for the groundfish fleet. Just tying through history this year, industry raised alarm about this as early as possible. Sarah mentioned the open public comment from Gary Ripka, but also there was comment from Jeff Lackey at that point, and overwhelming support from all sectors in the GAP back then to start building some lasting flexibility in our specifications process to address this more holistically. There were comments then, again, organized comments from industry in 2025 also underscoring that there was this need to address things differently. And then in June 2025 the GAP statement under inseason had another big set of information about the synergistic effects of these reductions. And then our work in the June meeting to build the specifications flexibility action that we're going to hear about again in November. And then now we have this brand new information in the catch-only projections. In the SSC Report there's a note that the impacts on stock status are less than 1% throughout the period of projection and the revised ABCs remain below the overfishing limits. And they endorsed the OFLs and ABCs for use for the 2026 year. And then for that minimal biological impact, I'm going to repeat some of the benefits that the GAP listed in their report. So they listed increased access to target species, more flexibility for fishermen to choose their harvest strategies, decreased costs of movement, increased revenue for commercial and charter sectors, increased access for recreational sectors, decreased gear conflicts with other fisheries, more stability for vessel owners and crew, and more stability for processors and improved supply to the markets. With all of that I think this meets the criteria for an emergency action. People are planning their fishing years right now and their allocation portfolios for the 2026 year. The time that it would take to complete notice and comment rulemaking or complete a fishery management plan amendment or to change the specifications would be significant and the changes would not go into effect at a point where these modest increases would be beneficial to the groundfish fishery or support annual planning for the fleet. And again, there's no conservation risk to the stocks in question. An emergency could prevent significant direct economic loss and could preserve significant fishing opportunities that might otherwise be foregone if we weren't to increase these specifications. A few other notes. The increases are small, but they have, again, a big expanse for operational flexibility. And while we're doing this as an emergency right now, I'll point again to all of the work that the Council's already doing to increase flexibility in other longer-term actions. So in the specifications flexibility action there's tools that we could use to buffer against these kinds of situations in the future. There's the big sea carryover that everybody's been talking about, but also another big set of tools that we would use to buffer against these. Again, all the discussion yesterday about potential if-then statements that the Council could use, and earlier today our discussion of the canary rockfish allocation idea that could create some flexibility within the different boxes that we've created. And then with widow rockfish, I hear everybody talking ahead of time about what we could do to buffer the impacts of industry. And so I just want to say that I know that the Council is working hard in all these other areas to make sure that we don't have to do an emergency again. We don't want to manage through emergency, but, and we're trying not to in the future, but this is necessary right now. The GMT Report, again I just want to hit on the underattainment idea, those familiar with the fishery know that attainment is not reflective of access in this fishery. And I know from experience with the fleet that I work with that the underattainment represents really high avoidance costs in our case, and I know that's true for a lot of other sectors as well. And then the last note is again, the GAP Report and the GMT Report differ, but my motion references the GAP Report and the additional, or the proportional distribution of additional allocation across sectors. And that is it for now. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:25] Thank you. I'll look around and see if there's any questions for clarification on the motion? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:14:41] Thank you. Thank you for the motion Miss Szumylo. I want to say this at this point, you know not cutting off the discussion, but from what I've heard around the table that it seems like there's a lot of support for this and so sort of guessing I want to say these points. For procedural reasons I have to vote no on this motion to avoid a unanimous vote. Under the Magnuson Act a unanimous vote on an emergency measure requires the Secretary of Commerce to implement the action. This no vote is meant to preserve the discretion of the Secretary and it is NMFS policy on all emergency actions. This vote should not be seen as an indication that NMFS does not favor the action or does not think it can be implemented. If not for the procedural issue I would vote in favor of the motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:30] Thank you. Any other discussion on the motion? Not seeing any discussion then I think we're ready to call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:15:44] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:46] Opposed?

Keeley Kent [00:15:50] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:51] Abstentions? The motion passes with one no vote, National Marine Fisheries Service. Thank you Aja for that motion. I'm going to look around. Can we get our task list back up there and I will turn to Jessi. I'm assuming we've covered everything but that's a dangerous place to go.

Jessi Waller [00:16:28] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes, you have completed your Council task today. So after this meeting we will be working with the National Marine Fisheries Service to transmit your recommendation on the emergency rule to revise 2026 specifications and measures for canary, shortspine and petrale with the hope that these are in place as early as possible for the 2026 season.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:54] All right, thank you. Anything else to be said here on this agenda item? Keeley Kent.

Keeley Kent [00:17:03] Thank you Chair. I'll just note, I'm sure most folks around the table recollect this but when the Council requests emergency action and if the agency issues that, the initial emergency action is only for 180 days and then we have the opportunity to do an extension for another 186 days that requires a separate Federal Register Notice, so that's something that we'll be thinking about at that midpoint. We will....there is sort of a test there that the Council is addressing this issue permanently, right? And it's the notion that this, emergency rules are rare and we don't want to set a precedent that that's the direction that we're going and so sort of reminding folks that we'll have to come back, not necessarily the Council, but NMFS will have to come back and do a second action if we do issue this first one in order to cover an entire calendar year.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:55] All right, thank you for that reminder. I'll look around and make sure there's no other comments or additions to this discussion. I'm not seeing any. Jessi we are done? All right, and we'll close out this agenda item.

H. Cross Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

1. Adaptive Management and Flexibility - Scoping

Butch Smith [00:00:00] All right, now we're entering in Council discussion. We may discuss. Miss Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:00:11] Thank you Vice-Chair Smith. I heard a lot of the same kind of topics and ideas from the different groups and so that's really great. I feel like the direction of this is going to go in a right....we're not....everybody isn't going in a different direction. We all kinda seem to be on the same page, the advisory bodies, and where Gilly through her presentation has set a good tone and direction for things. So thank you Gilly for that and your effective coordination across the groups. So I just, pointing that out and also recognizing some of the groups maybe didn't see certain things as priority, the same ranking and priority as others but they're all in the same ballpark, so that's very helpful, I think, for us to move forward. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:01:06] Thank you. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:01:08] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. It's been interesting to hear everybody circle around a variety of topics on this agenda item. And it is, I think, encouraging to hear that as we continue to circle, we get closer and closer to finding hopefully a variety of paths to give us the flexibility that we need. I am just going to put it out there for everybody, I do have a little bit of concern around specifically if-then statements, and somebody mentioned them as trigger statements. I think that they could potentially be triggering for some of us in terms of how, you know, kind of you set the course and away you go with them potentially, but that isn't really where my concern is. I spend a lot of time on Excel and I worry that if we just do if-then and don't have that wider suite of things and don't have a bit of conversation around that, if we take it as if-then rather than if-and, or if-or, or if, if-then, that we may be limiting ourselves and really what we're trying to accomplish by creating those trigger points to have fisheries participants get access to the actions that they're wanting as quickly as needed. And the example I would give that's probably top of mind coming out of HMS is the fact that this year is not a U.S.-Canada treaty regime. If we put in an if-then statement that was specific to how our fishers operated without that condition, you know, now you're looking at a decision tree about what happens in this case if this else, this other thing. So not opposed to using the language around if-then, but just wanting to remind everybody that there is probably a little wider application when we're developing if-and-then statements. Moving through this process should we have a motion that moves forward, that we might want to consider some of those other alternatives for if-statements in general.

Butch Smith [00:03:51] Thank you Christa. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:03:56] Yeah thanks. Following from Christa's thoughts it's kind of hard, I just had to remind myself we're not in groundfish anymore, we're in a different mindset. But yeah, so I'm having trouble figuring out like this is supposed to, I think Rebecca said it nicely, you know, thinking big investing in the future, and it's hard, but we do have a lot of if-then situations like the HMS one, which I think came from NMFS's protected species angle was the loggerhead closure for whatever El Nino years. But in groundfish it seems like we're trying to get away from if-then statements, more like the at-sea set-asides as being one, for example, where it's, you know, if the at-sea sectors exceed their set-aside, it used to be then they're closed, and now it's like, then but that didn't really make sense because everyone else was under and so why would we do that? And then we still don't know what the....so then do we add a if? They go over and the risk of the ACL is not at.....so it is more, in many situations you want to, you want the discretion to.....yeah we're not computers like Christa says, we're super literal and have to follow if-thens but good judgment is possible. So again, What I'm just saying is I don't know

that asking everyone just to think about if-then would be the best use of time, but if-then as part of being creative in other ways, so it's not, I'm not saying it's not an either or, just kind of expressing similar thoughts to Christa. But how can we be more, achieve these goals in our various FMPs, and really we're just kind of setting course here and helping those working on the project use the time and resources constructively.

Butch Smith [00:05:51] Miss Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:05:51] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I really appreciate both Christa's comments and Corey's and agree wholeheartedly. Coincidentally, I too think about HMS. When I think about trigger mechanisms, or if-thens, the one that comes to mind immediately for me is actually about bluefin and implementing the IATTC resolution on the commercial catch limit, and that an initial trip limit is set, and then if we attain a certain total level of catch then that trip limit is sequentially reduced as we accumulate catch towards that limit. I think....I remember back to the time that that was developed and what was exciting about it, and it was through our HMSAS, and it came out of necessity, much like the CPS incidental limits for sardine. And similarly I think about Pacific halibut, and I think the mechanisms there where if catch is, or if our two-way TAC is above 1.3 million pounds then, and I think about similarly Washington recreational and the sablefish north of Chehalis allocation, if the Washington rec amount is X amount then the halibut amount is Y, and those are great examples. And I think what Corey is hitting on is that they're very specific and they don't have those big caveats around them that Christa's rightfully acknowledging that we would need to kind of dream up. And kind of looking toward the GAP statement I really appreciate what they said, and Rebecca highlighted it, like maybe this is like more work than it's worth. I think they're a great tool, but the situations kind of have to present themselves and to try to dream up what if-then statements we might need seems like it might be an unproductive and not very effective use of our limited resources here. So just some thoughts. I really appreciate the GAP contemplating that and the remarks around the table. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:08:25] Miss Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:08:25] Thank you Chair. I was....well, yeah I have a comment and then a question for Gilly, but I'll start with my comment. I was raised in a fisheries region that uses a lot of if-then kind of statements and I'm not as scared of them as everybody here is, but this Council tends to....I mean you got, yeah I need this Council to acknowledge that you meet every Council meeting for an inseason action for a fishery to like tightly tinker and monitor it every moment throughout the year. So that is the way that this Council's functioned for a long time, and I see that there can be a lot of hesitance to going to a model that like has less, yeah less full control, but I guarantee because you are so scared of it you're not going to pick something that is going to end up in a place where it like really messes with everybody. Like you guys are, yeah, just reminding this Council that your tendency is to be over-scared of those things so I see this as an exercise to like think of ways that could this be useful? Could this be helpful in any way? I don't think anyone's going to accidentally put a measure in that really, really, really limits everybody. I know that that is a possibility, but I know the fear of it is going to be actually the more limiting thing on this side. So that's just an observation with a lot of experience from someplace else so. And yeah with that, you know I don't think it's just this like wandering exercise of like looking out into the ether and thinking of options. There are a lot of options in other regions that are already tested and looked at that I think we can map over to situations that are similar, and I think it'll become really apparent which ones don't work very well. So yeah, I just wanted to offer the counter to like, I'm actually a little bit more optimistic about if-then statements and I'd like to see what's out there and if it's not a good idea, great, let's not do it, but let's at least think about it. And then my question for Gilly is, there are.....if-then statements are the only thing that I really see in the set of tools that you put forward that require Council action, the rest of them I read as things that we can choose to do as a Council community or that the Council staff can develop on its own or that, you know, I see a lot of

things here that just like involve, yeah, coming together and deciding to change in some way as a group. So I see a lot of process things that aren't necessarily regulatory changes. So I'm curious if you guys discussed that part of the equation too? Like how the Council might motivate things that don't really require.....yeah, like one example is the EFP processes. We don't have to change the regulations to streamline the EFP process. So yeah, what is the intention around picking up those things that don't require regulatory change?

Gilly Lyons [00:11:27] Thank you very much Mr. Vice-Chair. Miss Szumylo thanks for the question. Excuse me. Yes, that's....there are definitely I think a number of things in the paper that are more sort of Council process and procedural in nature for sure. And although I think there may be some that would require additional Council action if not a regulatory change, and I think perhaps the EFP process improvements would fall under that sort of slightly hybrid category in terms of being, you know there would be perhaps a need for COP changes, maybe even an FMP amendment if we're changing any language inside an FMP around the EFP process but not in a regulatory sense. There may also be a couple of procedural or sort of COP related changes if the Council were interested in looking at maybe trying to improve the front-loading sort of collaboration process around regulatory amendments between the Council and NMFS, and so there might be a change potentially to Council Operating Procedure 11 or there may be other COPs that I'm not thinking of, but there may some things in there that would require some more, some Council motions and action. And then there are of course, yes, many things that could be advanced under maybe sort of an efficiencies umbrella or things that might be, yes, a little bit more sort of the staff could perhaps advance and of course bring back in any way that would be desirable to the Council. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:13:20] So before I come to you Miss Riding, just to be thinking as, I'm not cutting off discussion, but I'm new at this, but task one looks like kind of a motion type task so be thinking about that when we're in discussion. Miss Riding.

Corey Ridings [00:13:38] Thanks Vice. I just....it was interesting hearing this conversation about if-then, because I remember years ago on the EIS when some of these discussions were first happening that Scott McMullen actually came up with that idea and we were chatting about it and having discussions and it's just fun to think of him and think about a conception and the discussions we used to have about that and the nexus there, and it reminded me just of how long this body of work has been going on. And so I just wanted to thank the EWG specifically and the EAS for all the work that they've put in that's gotten us here, and thank Gilly for a great report that really laid out a lot of things. And just recognizing this as kind of, you know, helping us wrestle like just a big multi-year tuna down to the deck, so thank you. Thank you Vice. Hopefully we'll have a motion soon. In lieu of that, I'm hoping that sort of whatever motion might come out of this that this is, from my understanding, reading the report and thinking about where this goes, we'll an opportunity hopefully early next year whenever Council staff decides is right to come back and look at this again, and this is an example or this is a time to kind of further hone, get more ideas, talk to people, get some of the stuff that came into the advisory body reports and then revisit it. So just putting that out as fodder. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:15:07] Thank you. Miss Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:15:09] Thank you Vice Chair-Smith. I appreciate the background on the if-then statements and kind of the history and the hesitancy there, but kind of wearing my GAP hat a little bit and thinking of how they were thinking of things like this. It doesn't always have to be a punitive option. It can also be an, if we have under attained on something by a certain point in the season then we can add an extra fish in the bag, extend a season a week, a month, you know something like that. And so just much like uncertainty buffers they tend to go negative most of the time. They can also go positive, which I think is just another way of reframing things and how these tools can be used and we don't have

to put in a punitive if-and or then, or however that works out. And again, if this is just a no for folks I get that, but I would like to put it out there that it can also be used as a positive to help provide opportunity in those narrow spots.

Butch Smith [00:16:31] Miss Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:16:32] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Just because I opened I feel like a little bit of Pandora's box here on the conversation, I just want to be clear that it wasn't a, hey we're scared of if-then statements. When I started down this path it really was, hey the folks I've talked to in HMS who have had the if-then that Marci has put out there, we're basically saying, hey let's make sure that we include the flexibility so that it can be if-and or if if-then. We can call them if-then statements, that's fine, but just making sure that we acknowledge that, hey the opportunity there isn't specific to we set a path on if something happens, then something happens, and it could be a positive. In our case it absolutely was a positive for bluefin, where we got the flexibility we needed based upon the IATTC measure. So I just, I think it's important to acknowledge that it isn't just, hey people are cautious or they're worried about what if we put ramps out there. Maybe it's scarier for groundfish people. I mean I don't naturally come out of the groundfish community. I certainly enjoy working with everybody in it, but HMS doesn't have the privilege of having inseason adjustments every meeting nor do I don't think any of the other FMPs, so you know we may have, some of us that are more familiar with having that flexibility. And again, just those that I've talked to, and it has not been hundreds of people by any means, asking to have flexibility considered should we pursue this path.

Butch Smith [00:18:36] Corey.

Corey Niles [00:18:36] Yeah, I think....and I don't want to get into a contest about with Aja about who's thought about if-thens is more than, but we think about it all the time and we're not scared about it. It's just like, we've....the green light in the groundfish is an if-then, but it's if this change is beneficial enough to make it work. But yes, again, same with Christa, not saying let's not do it, but it's like, yeah but like with our Vice-Chair is saying let's get on to the tasks.

Butch Smith [00:19:04] So.....got questions? We'll take them. Oh, okay, I just wanted to say that we're having a lot of good discussion and it's kind of....I don't want to preclude discussion, but if we're having somebody that has a motion somewhere rattling around the air. I'm going to take Miss Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:19:30] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I do not have a motion, but I'd like to ask a clarifying question of Gilly, which might assist with that process.

Butch Smith [00:19:39] Clarify away.

Sharon Kiefer [00:19:41] So in your list of Council tasks in the Situation Summary you had adopt a problem statement. In your H.1 Attachment 1 Report on Page 3, you have an overview and assessment of the problem with some highlighted words about the objective of the project. I noted in the groundfish report they stated support for the problem statement in the staff report. Is that a reference to the highlighted information of the project objective on Page 3 of your Report 1?

Gilly Lyons [00:20:36] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Thank you Miss Kiefer for the question. I'm not 100% sure if it's a reference to that, or there's also on I think Page 6 of Attachment 1, there's some language about halfway down, a little more than halfway down the page about the CC being a very variable place and that changes are only constant and all the various things that make this a very dynamic place in which to do our work and that that leads to the uncertainty that may require more flexibility and adaptive capacity. So I'm not sure if it's that or something a little further up.

Sharon Kiefer [00:21:21] Thank you. I wasn't sure either. I should have asked during the groundfish report. I apologize for not doing that and I was just wondering if you maybe had some additional clarity. Thank you.

Gilly Lyons [00:21:33] Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:21:33] Thank you Sharon. Alrighty, I think we're going to try this because there'll probably be just some discussion on maybe if there's a motion somewhere. Oh Aja, all right. Go ahead.

Aja Szumylo [00:21:48] Thank you Vice-Chair. Okay, I move that the Council adopt the following problem statement, because management decisions in the Council process often unfold over years, Council actions can lag behind changes in the marine environment related to climate change and other unexpected events, for example, natural disasters and pandemics. We need to improve Council processes and operating procedures to support timely responses to rapidly changing conditions. And then, direct Council staff within the timeline of the funding for this project to develop execution plans for, if then management actions for FMPs, could you pluralize FMP? Where they make sense to allow for action to happen outside of a Council meeting. EFP process improvements for all FMPs using lessons from the FIW and including pathways to efficiently move tested EFPs into regulation. And then improve processes for data streams and integration of local and indigenous knowledge.

Butch Smith [00:23:04] Okay, is the motion reflected on what you....and accurate on the screen there.

Aja Szumylo [00:23:13] Yeah.

Butch Smith [00:23:13] Okay. Can I get a second? Corey Ridings. Thank you. Do you.....speak to your motion, please?

Aja Szumylo [00:23:23] Thank you. I'll start just echoing appreciation to the advisory bodies and to Council staff on the really well detailed report. There are a lot of options out there for, or of processes and things that fall under the label of adaptation, so I commend you for how you've been....it made it easier to think through paths forward here. Those of you who know me know that this is a really important area for me. I always want things to move faster here, but I think that it's important because we have a lot of change going on. Yeah, just a personal story here, I was here when the pandemic hit. I was in Keeley's job then when the pandemic hit. And I remember we were trying to do as much as we could to help industry. I remember Heather requested an emergency rule for the whiting sector. We were trying use inseason actions to move around the RCAs. We were tying any trick that we could to make things easier for everyone and were really stuck because we didn't do the work beforehand. We did not invest the effort ahead of time to be able to get ourselves out of these situations more easily and so it made it harder for everyone, it made a lot more work. And so I see a lot of the projects that we're working on right now as representative of that investment, that initial investment that we need to make to get out of things faster later when they arise. And there are more messes that are going to arise really quickly, sorry to tell everyone that but that's going to happen. So the problem statement, I recognize that a lot of the advisory bodies offered forward problem statements. I hope that this captures the spirit of some of those, but I just tried to be more economical with words, but I'm open, yeah I should say up front with this whole motion, I mean this to be collaborative. I do not mean to like steal the show on this. I'm just trying to move this forward. So I welcome changes if you have them. If there's something that's not reflected there I welcome amendments. So my point there with the problem statement is to say there are a lot of reasons that change could happen, environmental and otherwise. Again that's the, I mentioned natural disasters and climate change, but I mean like pandemics or changes to our international trade, things that we might be able to address with a fisheries management solution. I mean these things to address all those kinds of things, but we need the Council process to be able adapt

quickly when we need a speedy response. So with that, I selected three tools that I'd like to prioritize here. The question I asked to Gilly earlier about, you know where does this come up? My old regs brain was really trying to narrowly focus on the things that I saw that could be adjusted in regulation, but I also recognize that there, and through a lot of conversations with people, that there are probably a lot of other ways to.....the task at hand was more to just prioritize what we need to focus on first, and so I'll give some justification for this set of things over the other things that are on the list, though I hope that we can get to those things too. For if-then statements, I know for any FMP that makes sense, I heard a lot of questions from Marci about whether or not this makes sense for salmon, and I hear that. Like let's not spend the time in areas where we feel like we've got the right speed and responsiveness, but I just didn't want to close the door just in case there is something that could be helpful in those areas, so that's why the language of like for where they make sense. I really like what Jaime Diamond said about if-thens that provide opportunity. I really, you know, that might be an emphasis area to find things that like create space for people rather than things that constrain people, unless that constraint is really important for conservation. And then I think that's it for that one. I'll move on to.....this will cause a lot of discussion so we can do that later. For EFP processes, everyone knows how I feel about EFPs, but I just want to say here that, you know the FIW had a lot discussions in HMS that I think can inform changes to other FMPs. I know that the other FMPs are very different, but I think the Council can look for.....I'm trying to task staff with looking for ways that we can create speed and efficiency around that process. It is cost, I recognize the benefit of bringing EFPs into this process, but I also want to highlight how costly it is to me in the way that we do for extended amounts of time. I mean we don't even have our advisory bodies here for cost savings, and so then when I think about spending two full, two Council meetings worth of time and effort to review something that the Council does not necessarily have to be involved in I get very, that this is a, and I'll stop here, that's the pet peeve of mine, so I....we can talk at the bar later about that more if you'd like to. But one example lesson that I know came out of a FIW was like a discussion that if, you know if we are to choose a single Council meeting to have EFPs come forward, perhaps we choose a time that's off fishing season so that fishermen can make it to that meeting. So that is, that's the kind of lesson that I'm looking for to take from the FIW process that already happened. And I'm hoping, because of all the good work that they did over in that special project, that there are things that we can easily adapt into the rest of the, frame the rest to the COPs as well. And then for data streams and integration of local and indigenous knowledge, we had a lot of discussion earlier today when we were talking about groundfish about the desire and the capability of the folks who are closest to the environment to add information to our growing, our understanding of what's happening, and I think that we need to make a lot of good space for that however we can. I was at the Council ongoing, Council Member Ongoing Development Training back in, I can't remember when it was, it was March maybe, and we heard from the South Atlantic Council, they have a really long ongoing citizen science project where they work with the SSC to think about a data stream that they would like brought into the process that the community can help bring into the process, and the SSC helps them define the way that the data needs to be collected, blesses the data collection overall, and then going into the future that information can be pulled in and used in certain ways that folks can see. And so there are models out there for how to do this. I'd like to see if we can start to build something like that. We've heard over and over and over again from the groups that we serve that they can help in these process. And I think that help creates better understanding, it creates space for better conversations across all of us about this, so I'd to invest time there If we can. I think that item, the other two I think are things that really get developed in the two years. I think the process for how to pull the indigenous and local knowledge into the system I think is something that can be developed in the 2 years, but then I see that as something that's errative and goes on forever and ever. There may be new data streams that arise or new ways of collecting information that arise that we can try to build into the system in the future. So that one I see as an unending one. So that ones not like, oh you come up with the set and then we box it up, but this one's more like you come up with a process for how to look at and how to effectively incorporate new data streams and then that process can live in perpetuity. And so I'll stop there. Again, I intend this motion to be collaborative. I will....I feel like this has happened a couple

times before where I've ended up really defending the points in something, but like change it if you don't want this to be the set or the way then I welcome your thoughts. That's it.

Butch Smith [00:31:55] Thank you Aja. Are there questions on the motion? Not discussion, but questions? Corey.

Corey Niles [00:32:08] Yeah, it's kind of a fine line between....well first of all I don't....maybe it's just the screen, but I didn't, did someone, didn't Corey second it? Okay, that's good. So on that, the bullet that reads we need to improve Council processes and operating procedures, I guess I would read that, because in hearing you talking it's not focusing only just on the Council process, it's dealing with the greater context of how the Council process operates, including like that we talked about all the science that supports it, all the administrative requirements and such that we operate under. So I would read that to encompass kind of the context in which the Council also operates. Am I interpreting that correctly?

Aja Szumylo [00:33:20] Thank you for the question Corey. Yes, you are interpreting it correctly. So I....that is probably shorthand for like the royal Council process for all the things that tie into this. So I..... if there's a better wording that is more reflective of that to you then I'm open to amending it, but yes I'm meaning it to encompass the things that you're suggesting.

Butch Smith [00:33:53] All right, I see that Mr. Ryan Wulff has his hand up and I hope you haven't had your hand up for like three hours Ryan...(laughter).....so I apologize if you have. So Ryan, take her away.

Ryan Wulff [00:34:07] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. No, you're perfect. I just put it up. I had a clarifying question for the maker of the motion. Thank you Miss Szumylo for the motion. Just to clarify here, right? We have a couple action items under this agenda item. One is adopt a problem statement so you've clearly got that here. My question is more with the second direction here. I'm not familiar really with the term 'execution plans'. So the second action item we have is, "provide guidance on developing a range of alternatives, including identifying a narrow list of priority actions that can be accomplished within the special project timeframe", so my assumption here is the intent of your second bullet and the sub-bullets therein is towards that second action and essentially providing guidance that would help be developed in the range of alternatives to come back before the Council. Is that correct?

Butch Smith [00:35:06] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:35:06] Thank you for the question Ryan. Yes, you are correct. I introduced new language that we don't use normally so I'm sorry for that. But yes, I mean it to address the bullet that you referenced. And I'm open to changing the language to not execution plans if that ruffles anyone.

Butch Smith [00:35:32] Ryan, is that? All right. Any more questions of the motion maker before we get to.....okay, Brad.

Brad Pettinger [00:35:46] Yeah, thank you Vice-Chair Smith. Maybe it'd be good to maybe take a break and just maybe talk offline and maybe figure out what it's going to be because it could be a long night here. I think it'd good if we got people to maybe just stand down here for like 10 minutes maybe and figure out what that might be or unless you're already there. I'm just saying just as an alternative to the open dialogue on the floor here right now.

Butch Smith [00:36:24] Miss Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm thinking about Ryan's question and maybe I will pose a question somewhat differently. That second big bullet, "direct Council staff to develop plans for".....and then you have the three items and you explained how you reached the decision to include those three items, but I think what Ryan might be getting at is are we....what is the....why are we making it a motion, or part of the motion language as opposed to just giving guidance? Is there a reason that the language needs to be in motion form or would verbal guidance suffice?

Butch Smith [00:00:53] I'm going to turn this one over to our Executive Director who's dying to answer that question. Thank you.

Merrick Burden [00:01:01] Let's see, between execution and dying I think we're right in the theme here. Let's see Miss Yaremko, in response to your question, my personal preference is that the first major bullet, a problem statement, be made through a motion. I don't think that was your question though. The second one, this Council staff direction, if there's any debate about what you're asking us to do I prefer it to be a motion, if it's guidance without consensus it's just one person's opinion. So I suspect that there is a little bit of debate. I think either way a motion isn't harmful. And I have some other thoughts when you're ready Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Butch Smith [00:01:46] I think we're ready for those thoughts.

Merrick Burden [00:01:50] Let's see, some additional thoughts from me then on the second major bullet, just since it is directing staff. And there was a question about what the language here refers to. The way that I interpret this is that the execution plan is that we are time-bound with this work and so we would be as staff putting together a series of essentially proposals for you that we think are doable within the time-bounds of this project, or imminent right after the time-bounds of this project. That's how I interpret a execution plan. That's what a successful execution would look like. And then looking at the balance of the sub-bullets here, I interpret this to be giving us latitude to look across our various FMPs and our various processes to figure out where we can do these things within the timeline of the project.

Butch Smith [00:02:55] Sharon.

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:55] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And just a curiosity question for the Executive Director. If we proceed with a motion, and let's say staff starts their work and maybe something absolutely brilliant that we had not contemplated arises and they bring that forward to the Council, you know, gee, this would really be great but it wasn't in the motion. I mean are we, can we be somewhat adaptive as this goes on or would we have to revise the original motion to be able to incorporate an element that was not originally considered?

Merrick Burden [00:03:43] Through the Mr. Vice-Chairman, I appreciate the question Miss Kiefer. And if I interpret your question correctly, if we discover something brilliant we'll find a way to get it on your agenda. We won't be....we won't constrain ourselves.

Butch Smith [00:04:06] Miss Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:04:06] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And I guess I have one more question for our Executive Director, and this is based upon what came out when I was fairly new on the Council from Mr., I think it was Mr. Anderson, who was very clear that Council members did not direct staff. And I would not be channeling him right now if we had not already had a pretty robust conversation, but I do wonder if my colleague from Oregon's comment about maybe we need a few minutes to wrap our heads around language to have what will be up there that is appropriate might be beneficial, because

I think there seems to be a lot of goodwill in terms of the motion and goodwill in terms of, hey, if people want to amend, open to friendly amendments. But I'm a little worried we're going to get into, hey, we make an amendment to wordsmith and then somebody else jumps in. So just wanting to confirm with you about directing staff, if that is still the component that we are recommending that Council members do not direct staff, that our Executive Director does, or if we have a new set of rules at this point in time?

Butch Smith [00:05:32] Mr. Merrick go ahead.

Merrick Burden [00:05:37] I appreciate the question Miss Svensson. And technically you're correct that the Council directs the Executive Director. It's also there's some personal preference and it's done both ways, and as your Executive Director I'm happy to take it both ways. I am also staff is the way I see it, so if this is a hang up I would say probably not worth worrying about right here. We can move forward and I think I know how to interpret this. But technically you are correct in that the Council directs the Executive Director rather than the staff.

Butch Smith [00:06:18] So what I'm going to do is hearing from some wise sources I'm going to take a 10 minute break. Huddle up. I might go get some Maalox and we'll come back and finish this out. So all right we're going to take a 10 minute break. Thank you.....(BREAK).....Let's get started. Chris Oliver have that book ready and keep me out of Robert's Rule jail, all right? All right here we go. All right so now we're back to more questions on the motion, maybe an amendment I'm hearing or discussion. What's the Council's flavor? Miss Marci I saw first. All right Miss Marci.

Marci Yaremko [00:07:40] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. If I may I'd like to offer a few amendments to the language on the screen. So at the end of the problem statement, nope, so after that parenthetical that says, "natural disasters and pandemics", "and keep pace with the science that underpins management decisions". And then under the second bullet where it says, or I'm sorry, second bullet, first sub-bullet, "if then management actions", after "if then" add the words, "and inseason". That completes my amendments. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:09:11] Does the language reflect and look complete?

Marci Yaremko [00:09:16] Yes Mr. Vice-Chair, it does.

Butch Smith [00:09:25] Okay, second?

Marci Yaremko [00:09:28] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:09:29] Speak on your motion, please.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:31] Thank you. I'm going to speak.....

Butch Smith [00:09:33] Your amendment. Excuse me.

Marci Yaremko [00:09:34] Yes, I'm going to speak to the second element of this amendment. The addition of, "and inseason management actions for FMPs where they make sense to allow for actions to happen outside a Council meeting". First I want to say I'm not afraid of if-thens, I actually love them, but the circumstances need to present themselves to develop them. So inseason management actions, I just I can't say enough about our salmon inseason process. And I'm looking around this table and I'm looking over at Butch because he's a friendly face on those inseason calls, I'm not sure how many folks have had an opportunity to join into them and to kind of get a breadth of the types of actions that are

taken on an inseason basis and how they are published and how they are effectuated. So that's one area that I'd really love for staff to explore is the application of that process to other FMPs. And in particular, I'm thinking about Jaime's point about how do we do these actions to allow for more opportunity, and I'm thinking about our sablefish inseason actions that we do most meetings and many times we're making those adjustments. The GAP is recommending to us that we go up or that we down because we're tracking high or tracking low. In salmon we do those all by phone call by a meeting of the SAS reps, NMFS staff, agency staff, co-manager staff, and we take those actions on a very quick and easy conference call. And then NMFS publishes a notice and away we go. It works very, very well and we achieve the objectives of the FMP. That framework of those inseason actions is well defined. So, I mean there are still boxes to work within, but the types of inseason actions that we can take to move people around, to roll over impacts so that we if your....essentially if you're tracking low or you don't attain a limit in a quota period, you can roll over that catch on an impact-neutral basis and allow essentially full attainment of the limit, and so it's kind of a constant process. I mean year to year we might take 40 plus inseason actions. So in terms of it being efficient and allowing attainment of the FMP objectives and providing or accounting for current conditions, it's really, I think, an excellent example that we might look to for other FMPs. The other thing I was thinking about with regard to the if-then statements, again I love them. Maybe one little bit of maybe a recommendation, if perhaps it would be worth summarizing all of those in one place if we can pull them out of all of the various FMPs where they exist? We talked about the examples from CPS. We've talked about the example of bluefin, the halibut Catch Sharing Plan. Sometimes these circumstances present themselves and you know the solutions are there, they're just in other FMPs that were developed years ago. And I'm thinking about the bluefin example that we have today, and then I'm also thinking, Jaime you may not have been around for this, but when we were talking about bluefin bag limits, we actually talked about a trigger type of mechanism that if catch was tracking at X level inseason and if it was below that level then we could go from two to three or two to one. And so I think the applications are there, they're just kind of buried in various nooks and crannies of different FMPs. So that's just one suggestion. Maybe pull together a list of them and they might make a nice handy cheat sheet. With that I will pass the baton. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:14:18] Thank you Miss Marci. Any questions on....oh I'm sorry. Go ahead Pete.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:25] Sorry Mr. Vice-Chair. To be efficient we kind of tag teamed on the amendment. I wanted to speak to the other one that's up there?

Butch Smith [00:14:35] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:35] Just speak to that. Because of the virtue of my position here and also on Pacific States Marine Fish Commission, I've had the opportunity to hear the Director of NOAA Fisheries, Mr. Eugenio Soler speak twice. At the May Council Coordinating Committee he gave us some opening remarks and one of his statements was, the Councils are where science meets reality. That meant a lot to me and you think about it what we did here even today with stock assessments and some of the other things, the Science Centers bring that science to us and we convert it, translate it into a management decision process. The work is important here. Two weeks ago at the Pacific States Annual Meeting he gave some opening remarks there. One of his statements was the science has far outpaced the management and our ability to make management decisions. So I put those two together and I thought that's important to capture here. We're not just talking about climate, climate change and all of those things, we're talking about management response to those things. I think that statement, adding it in there, relates to the first bullet under the second major bullet there about decision-making and I think it applies to the last one. I think an example of it is two agenda items ago we talked about a new time-varying sigma approach that apparently got way ahead of the Council's headlights and I don't know when we'll take it up again, that's just an example of that. So I think it's important here. The thinking of the current administration, at least the Director of NOAA Fisheries, is the science and that

the Councils are this base where we translate science in the management, so we should capture that in the problem statement. So thank you.

Butch Smith [00:16:54] Thank you Mr. Chair. So are there any questions on the motion? Seeing none....on the amendment, sorry. Chris I need you. Okay, Council discussion on the amendment. Corey.

Corey Niles [00:17:21] Yeah, thanks. Just supportive of both and I think Pete's comments speak kind of what I asked on the original motion about the greater context and Marci brings up some really good examples. And after this I'm going to remind Aja about the shortbelly rockfish trigger we recommended when she was in Keeley's seat and the pain we had trying to figure out where to put that, but that was another trip. So no, thanks Marci, you had a lot of good ideas. I was going to say Butch came up, helped come up with an idea for the Columbia River and halibut and we had some issues implementing it last year the first time. So I like Marci's, I like the suggestions and I don't need to say anymore but wanted to add those in support.

Butch Smith [00:18:10] Miss Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:10] I had trouble finding the button. Thank you Vice-Chair Smith. I appreciate the work that everybody has done on this, Aja getting us started and the wordsmithing that's happened. While I'm not directly involved in any of the salmon processes, I am insanely jealous of the salmon processes and have been sort of half joking asking why we can't incorporate those into our other management. I also see Halibut as sort of being an in-between. It used to be a little simpler but we can do things outside of a Council meeting and that's where I'm familiar with the if-then statements because we have a lot of unknowns. We have to set our season structure in September and November and we don't get our quota till June. On a bigger scale of this we looked, I can't remember if it was in 2015 or for the 2015-16 spex, we tried to do like a big environmental impact statement for groundfish harvest specifications and then we could do a tiered EAs off that over a couple of years. We didn't think big enough, particularly like the canary rockfish. None of us would have thought canary rockfish ACL would have gone that high so we had to really do work. So just a caution that we need to think really broad as we're doing this otherwise we're going to keep ending in the same boxes. It is work up front but it does maybe have some potential to streamline our processes for things outside of salmon. I hope to not have to do 40 inseason things on groundfish in a season, but I do think there's potential to streamline things for us. Yeah, so thank you everybody for working on that.

Butch Smith [00:19:42] Anything else? Okay, I think I will call for the question. All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:19:52] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:19:53] Those opposed? Abstentions? The motion or amendment passes. All right, now we go back to the original motion amended and I think we were in discussion. I forgot, I think we're in discussion. Miss Ridings, oh wait, Miss Riding. I saw you first anyways so go. I don't know who I missed but go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:20:26] Thanks Vice. Well, thank you Aja for providing this platform and getting us going here. I'm going to speak to the second bullet, the third sub-bullet, the improved processes for data streams and integration of local and indigenous knowledge. Definitely in support of that and I think we heard a lot today and we've heard for a long time about why that's important. I wanted to flag the importance of vocabulary in this case, that local knowledge is very distinct and separate from indigenous knowledge. So if this moves forward I would hope that kind of the next step would include some vocabulary and definitions and that would include a deeper look at those two different types and

what they are and how they can be brought, those data streams and those types of knowledge into the process. That's it.

Butch Smith [00:21:19] Thank you Corey. Lynn Mattes please.

Lynn Mattes [00:21:29] Thank you Vice-Chair. I do want to echo Miss Ridings comments on the incorporation of indigenous knowledge into this. It's an important step. On that same section on the second bullet about incorporating the FIW, and this isn't a question for anybody in particular, just sort of a thought process question or.....words are failing, from the timing aspect, mentioning the trying to incorporate the FIW process, the FIW process is happening at the same time as this process so there's some timing issues. So what would that....what would it look like? How would we incorporate two simultaneous processes into each other? Not looking for an answer, just a thought that felt needed to be out there. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:22:27] Thank you. Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:22:29] Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. And maybe Gilly can answer this better, but the FIW has already proposed changes to the COP 20, some of which are going to apply to the COP that are relevant for EFPs for other FMPs, we're going to see that on Wednesday. So it's moving along and I think it's doing sort of its cross FMP business. So I just want to point that out that it is moving at simultaneous, the same way I hope that HMS will be able to learn and work with this process. Thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

Butch Smith [00:23:11] Thank you Dr. Lent. Corey Niles.

Corey Niles [00:23:15] Yeah, thanks Mr. Vice-Chair and yeah thanks for all the thought. The one question I have left in supporting is the one that Sharon asked about does this preclude brilliant ideas from coming forward and Merrick's answer was no we won't. Yeah I just think there's other ideas out there like the, like just having, I forget what it's called, but just having like a checklist type thing when we do decision-making about how that decision does or does not affect flexibility. So there's other easy hanging fruit, that I might not be in here and want to spend time trying to be exhaustive here, but trusting that the folks working on this project will not, you know maybe give these ones priorities of course. But I'm also having.....like that one that Corey spoke to, yeah what we all heard today how that actually happens, that could be a big lift. So interpreting this in that light of the back and forth with Sharon and Merrick and these may be the priorities but brilliant ideas that can fit in are not excluded in voting with that in mind.

Butch Smith [00:24:31] All right, any more discussion? Miss Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:24:35] Yeah, thank you. I will keep my comments quick. I just want to thank the maker of the motion for being gracious in terms of letting us work through a lot of discussion. I am also grateful for everybody here for taking the time to not wordsmith everything and to be willing to say, hey you know what we understand the intent. That includes our Executive Director so thank you there. I am also going to say, hey I'm appreciative of Gilly who I see taking furious notes. And just wanted to also touch base on the FIW component. We have done a fair amount of work, and as Dr. Lent mentioned, we are bringing forward some COP ideas here on Wednesday, but we are also having another FIW meeting on the 25th and 26th, so I think while we may be working in tandem to this, I think we also spent a fair amount of time working on how do we strategically work through all three of the IRA programs so that we had the ability to learn from them, incorporate what we need and have that agility. So happy to support the motion and just wanting to say thanks everybody for doing a lot of lift and working together tonight on this particular motion.

Butch Smith [00:26:00] Thank you Miss Svensson. Oh, Mr. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:26:11] Yeah, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair. Appreciate the comments just made by Miss Svensson. I bit my tongue a little bit there as I tend to pay very much attention to words and wanted to wordsmith. The first sub-bullet I still struggle how Council actions can lag behind but also keep pace, but I think Pete explained that in his intent and justification so I think that's clear, similar to the language around execution plans which Aja already explained when she initially made the first motion. So obviously I understand this is scoping. Support that Merrick also has stated he kind of has what he needs regarding to work with Council staff. The only thing I wanted to add to the discussion, and I was thinking about it looking at some of the alternatives that were before by the ecosystem groups, that of how we might look at other projects and other things that were also using the same funding and timeline and just noting that while the one of the other IRA projects has focused pretty heavily now on the EFP process and the FIW, it did also call out the potential for looking into dynamic ocean models, or dynamic ocean management and maybe that could be in something that Council staff kind of think about when they're looking at the final sub-bullet here for improved process for data streams. Maybe that's something that could captured or at least thought about in their takeaway from here as well. That's just the last piece I wanted to add. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:28:01] Thank you Ryan. All right, so we're kind of winding down here I think. Anymore discussion on the main motion? Seeing none, hearing none I'm going to call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:28:28] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:28:31] Opposed? Any abstentions? The motion passes. Thank you. So Miss Lyons have we completed our work here or do we still need to tackle two and three?

Gilly Lyons [00:28:51] Thank you very much Mr. Vice-Chair. You have had a great and robust discussion about all the various aspects of this Council action and you've adopted a problem statement and you have also provided guidance on developing a range of alternatives through the motion discussing developing time-bound plans for advancing priority actions under this project, so I think you've definitely tackled Number 2. And you've also provided some great guidance on next steps through sort of just general discussion. I think there were some great ideas that came out in the conversation around the motion, just other things that Council staff can be thinking about as we move forward on putting together some plans to bring back to you at a future meeting. So I think with all of that your work on this agenda item is complete.

Butch Smith [00:29:44] Well, thank you Miss Lyons for your guidance. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:29:46] Thank you Vice-Chair. I'm so sorry. My intention was to ask if there was a possibility for some of the other items in your report to be eaten by the Council efficiencies process and I'm wondering how to accomplish that. Maybe that's a question to Merrick.

Butch Smith [00:30:08] That would be a question for the Executive Director.

Merrick Burden [00:30:13] I've executed but eaten, okay. I guess without having those things in front of me at the moment it's hard for me to say exactly, but we have talked conceptually about where some of these items fit and I think as you know or you will see here soon, we do have Council efficiencies coming up in November. Most of that is driven by some Council direction from about a year and a half ago, but to the extent that this is still consistent with where we're heading there, I think we're happy to

consider those as part of that topic. Is that answering your question?

Butch Smith [00:30:55] Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:30:55] Thank you, and yeah, just to highlight what I'm referring to, there's some discussion of front-loading scope refinement for actions as they go through the Council process. There was mention of a continuous improvement framework. So there are, I think, a number of things that can be handled that we didn't prioritize in the motion that may fit well there and that don't require, in my view, Council action as a body beyond maybe them coming back through the efficiencies process. So yeah, perhaps the best path is when we discuss it in November to just reference back to this then. I don't imagine that anything will happen on those items between now and then anyway so.

Merrick Burden [00:31:48] Yeah, I think I understand what you're getting at. I would say the Council efficiencies item has been really aimed at cost reductions. And so to the extent we want to expand that and say it's about not only efficiencies but also effectiveness, which is where we started, like originally we were thinking that that would be about efficiencies and effectiveness. Let's talk about that in November about how to make that happen.

Butch Smith [00:32:22] Ms. Riding I see you up and down but go ahead.

Corey Ridings [00:32:27] All right, thanks Vice, if you're going to call me out. I was just thinking about what Aja just brought up and thinking about the report as a whole and I'm just, I think, agreeing with her and agreeing with that. There are definitely some things in the Council staff report that jumped out as maybe not the priorities that we just had in our motion but were good ideas and I think things that fit within the bucket that Director Burden just described, which was that they fit more in this efficiencies, or what did you just say? Effectiveness? Effectiveness, a potential effectiveness side onto that bucket. Something that came to the top of my list, I was thinking about the continuous improvement framework and about flexibility assessments and how those things might fit in there, I think Aja already said it, just thinking about the front-loading scope refinement. So just adding that I think that's a great idea and very open and we'll bookmark this to discuss in November.

Butch Smith [00:33:30] Thank you. Making one more look around the tables here. Okay. All right, so Miss Lyons without further, if you are satisfied I think I will close this agenda item.

2. Council Response to Executive Order and Administration Updates

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes our reports and our public comment. What we'll do here is we will probably take our break about 9.30, but we have an opportunity here to start some initial discussion on this and maybe a good starting point. Rebecca Lent had teed up a couple of questions. Maybe it's helpful if you can repeat those and we'll get some answers or discussion on that. Rebecca.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:32] Thank you very much Mr. Chair. And again, just asking out of all the things that we could have put in that matrix because there's quite a few, why is stock definitions in there? Maybe I'm missing something. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:45] Kelly Ames.

Kelly Ames [00:00:47] Through the Chair, thank you Council members. First, just to take one step back. In June the Council had two motions that were pretty broad and far-reaching and so we applied the Executive Order criteria, which were that you needed to have a work plan, including a NMFS implementation. So that was kind of our first way of filtering out between the letter and the matrix. When we looked at stock definitions you had final action scheduled on your Year-At-A-Glance for this meeting. So the stock definitions action, if you look at Attachment 5 in the matrix there's a description of how we felt stock definitions met the EO criteria, so we believe that it increases flexibility and could prevent closures by mortality of non-target diminutive species that are currently in the FMP. It may also increase profitability by focusing our limited resources on the stocks that are in need of conservation and management. So I don't have the exact counts, I'm sure Todd and Katrina do, but I believe we started around 86 species. And after the action that you took at this meeting and previous meetings I think you removed about 20. You designated about 12 as ecosystem components, and the remainder would be the ones where we focus our energies on. So that was the criteria by which we viewed that action relative to the EO.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:31] Thank you. That answer that question? And I believe you had one other, the interaction of various Executive Orders, was that something you wanted to....needed an answer on or?

Rebecca Lent [00:02:48] Thank you Mr. Chair. I guess it's pretty touchy, but it's just this whole idea of a lot of stuff has been thrown at us that makes our jobs harder. And now we're being asked, how can we make your jobs easier? So how do we handle that? Do we just ignore it and move on? Or can we have some reference to that? But you know I'm not a politician so help me out here.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:12] All right, I don't know if anybody wants to tackle that, or we recognize the complexities of doing that, but we have a responsibility of complying to a specific request here that we will do. Rebecca.

Rebecca Lent [00:03:34] Maybe...thank you Chair. Maybe another question. There's an open public comment period. Is it still open? I hope so. I assume that if we wanted to submit a comment we would have to do that as individuals and not mention any affiliation with the Council, but we could still write our own letters as public citizens, can we?

Pete Hassemer [00:03:58] Yes, Executive Director Burden I'll let him take that. John Ugoretz I see your hand up. We'll get to you, but we'll handle this question here.

Merrick Burden [00:04:09] Yeah, I appreciate the question. This sort of thing does come up periodically. I would say you as Council members also frequently serve as representatives of the Council. If you have an opinion that the Council has not organized itself around, then you would be

best, I think, required to represent yourself as an individual. So if you have a comment that you'd like to make to the Federal Register Notice there's nothing stopping you, but unless the Council has provided direction on a message, you would be representing yourself as an individual.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:48] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:04:51] Thanks Mr. Chair, good morning. I had some thoughts similar to maybe some of what Rebecca was saying. Yes, I think the constituents who spoke in public comment and our advisory bodies have given us a lot to think about. Honestly, I think much of that is perhaps beyond the scope of what we're trying to do today. We do have an Executive Order that is directing us to provide some priorities to respond. I think that the Council staff's efforts to narrowly focus that on a subset of activities that we have a schedule for and are anticipated to complete makes sense. I think there may be some minor wordsmithing to the letter that some of the advisory bodies have provided more directly in terms of underlying strikeout language that I might be able to support. I'm thinking that the Habitat Committee information where they provided some specific edits that I can read and agree with, I would be fine making those edits to the Council staff provided draft. But beyond that I'm really feeling like there's too much to get into here, too much to get into today, and that all of the information should certainly go on our back burner as far as information that helps the Council decide what to do in the future, but I don't think it needs to be either in the letter or in the matrix that staff provided. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:50] Thank you John. Any other sort of general high level things here? There were a lot of reports, a lot of information in there and public comment, so before we get to our action I want to make sure people have time to absorb that and think about how that applies to our action. Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:07:13] Thank you Chair. Yeah, just a short intervention to remind people that I specifically asked Sam Rauch in June, can we include things like leveling the playing field? Trade? Different things that are beyond the rulemaking, these things that are be on NOAA Fisheries, and he said yes, this is your chance to do that. And it's in that spirit that I see the member, Council Members Letter, and there is quite a bit in there. I think there's been a great effort to incorporate what we've heard from the advisory bodies. Maybe that list can be trimmed, but we do need that second letter because that's where we can talk about everything else that's beyond our purview. And when it comes to salmon, that's certainly the case. There's so much beyond our purview. When it comes bycatch and circle hooks, that's beyond our purview. Let's make sure that we take this opportunity to talk about things that are out of our control but keeping us from having sustainable, profitable, viable fisheries in the United States. Thank you Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:18] Thank you. John I see your hand's still up. Did you have something additional?

John Ugoretz [00:08:25] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yes, in response to Dr. Lents comment just now. I was speaking previously to item number 1 on the screen right now, the Attachment 4 and Attachment 5, which I think, again I'm suggesting that we keep somewhat narrowly focused and that we not make any significant changes to what Council staff has provided other than some simple wordsmithing where we have clear recommendations from our advisory bodies with underline and strike out to changes to the letter. With regard to Dr. Lents comments about what she asked and what Sam Rauch responded, sure, we can always provide information beyond the scope of what we do here. Honestly, I don't think the Council Member Report, the additional attachment, additional letter is ready to go. I think it would need significant wordsmithing to formulate into a letter that I feel confident that could go out under the Council's signature, and I don't support sending it right now.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:52] All right, thank you. Looking around here, I think this might be a good point to take our morning break so we can think about this and come back and be ready to take action. So let's take 15 minutes so you can get checked out of your room and come back, be ready to do work. Thank you.....(BREAK).....So we had time to think about it, look around for any other discussion and maybe we can get our task list up there, refresh our memory on what we need to do. There it is. One is a specific response to the Executive Order 14276, and the other is the considering the Council Member Report. So where are we? I can't believe we're done with everything here. Anybody want to take up Council task number 1? Okay, there's a hand up. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:11:29] Thanks Mr. Chair. Appreciate that folks have had some time to sit and think about this. When I'm looking through all of the reports regarding number 1 on the screen, I do find a few clear specific edits that could improve the draft letter found an Attachment 4, and I think I could support those as far as the staff revising the letter with those few edits specifically in the Habitat Committee and Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Reports. There's a lot of additional information in the other reports and I found them extremely valuable in terms of considering future workload and how we implement what we are saying we're going to do in this letter, but I don't really see the necessity to include all of those details and edits to the letter. With regard to the matrix, I think it's good as is. I think it's clear. I think it provides some good examples of how we are being responsive to the Executive Order and I wouldn't make any changes to it. So, love to hear what other Council members feel about that. And if no other action I have a potential motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:11] Thank you John. Let me look around and see if there's any further discussion on that. And I'm not seeing any hands here so why don't you go ahead with your motion.

John Ugoretz [00:13:26] Sure, if Council staff could pull up my first motion that would be great. I move that the Council update the draft letter found in Agenda Item H.2, Attachment 4 to include the specific strike out and underline recommendations found in the Habitat Committee Report, Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental HC Report 1, along with the wording suggestions and items for removal found in the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel Report, Agenda Item H.2.a, Supplemental GAP Report 1. And to submit the letter along with the matrix found in Agenda H.2, Attachment 5 response, in response to Executive Order 14276.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:20] Thank you John. I followed along. I'm assuming you can see what's on the screen before us. That all looks accurate and complete. Is that correct?

John Ugoretz [00:14:30] Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:32] All right, thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Please speak to your motion.

John Ugoretz [00:14:43] Thanks. I think in my comments just now I've explained my rationale here. Again, I don't want to lose the very good input that we received from our advisory bodies and constituents in public comment. I think there's a lot there. I think there's a lot of detail there that is helpful to move Council actions forward in the future, but that they are not necessary or necessarily responsive to the Executive Order. I believe that what Council staff have provided us is comprehensive and complete and with the minor specific changes to the letter that I note in the motion, I think we are adequately responding to this request.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:38] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:15:45] Thank you very much Chair, and thank you Mr. Ugoretz for the motion. I

just want to seek clarification. You're including in here underlying recommendations found in the Habitat Committee Report along with the wording suggestions and items for removal found in the GAP Report. The GAP suggested removing the stock definition. Is that what you meant? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:19] John.

John Ugoretz [00:16:19] Right, thanks. Fumbling with my buttons here. They recommended removing both the stock definition item and the risk table item and I'm okay with both of those removals.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:41] Further questions for clarification? Seeing no other questions, discussion on the motion? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:16:54] Thank you Chair. And thank you John for the motion. I do just want to pass along what I think is stated in some ways in the GAP Report, and I don't think the removals that John cited here meet it, but just this general frustration that the matrix does not go far enough to cover things that would be actually helpful to fishing industry. And I don't know if that sentiment is there in the other advisory bodies, but I know very much that it was there from the GAP. I do understand that the response to the Executive Order asks for something narrow, and I understand the benefits of doing something narrow there, but I know that it's hard to balance that with how intensely exhausted I know our advisory bodies are, and how frustrated they were not being with us this week and then having to do a lot of really good work from afar and in really difficult conditions. So I also think this contributes to their feeling that their ideas and voices aren't heard in this process, even though I think there was a lot of hope in this Executive Order, and so to have a response that is very restrained is not reflective of the things that they want to communicate. I know that they want, or that they have the opportunity to comment individually for their individual organizations, for themselves, through the Executive Order Federal Register Notice that just went out, and I know a lot of groups will do that, but a lot people choose to spend their time engaging with this process as part of the advisory bodies and so to not see that come across in what we do in a motion here, I don't know how that's going to sit with everyone. So I'll leave it there. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:58] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:19:01] Thanks Mr. Chair. Yeah, and thanks for those comments. I agree with the sentiment that there are any number of things that not only could but should be implemented to help our various stakeholders on all sides of the spectrum. I don't necessarily think we need to list out the entire specifics of all of those. And the reason I specifically highlighted the two changes that I'm suggesting, or the two set of changes that I'm suggesting, is that I felt they were specific and responsive and I felt that some of the other proposals and some of the other advisory subpanels requests are actually already included in this letter, perhaps just not with the level of detail that some people might want to include, but I don't feel that including all of that detail and some of the proposed responses would actually be beneficial, and I think it might harm our efforts in terms of being clear and concise in what we're suggesting.

Pete Hassemer [00:20:29] Other discussion on the motion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:20:34] Thank you Chair Hassemer. And thank you Mr. Ugoretz for your last explanation. I was going to bring up the idea that this motion recognizes the input from the Habitat Committee and the GAP but not others, so that, what you just explained, helps a lot. I'm thinking a lot about the time that folks on our management teams and advisory bodies put into this in the context of what we've heard around working remotely and the challenges of this meeting, and I agree I don't want them to view an action here as not recognizing their input. If anything, their reports are a resource for

us, but I say that also with the support for a streamlined letter and not wanting, needing to get into the details or that if we get too far into the details our message is lost. So thanks for the discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:21:50] Other discussion? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:21:52] Thanks Chair. Thanks John for this motion. I plan to support it. I know a lot of thought has gone into this. I'll just note, I do have some heartburn with removing the sentence on risk tables that the GAP has suggested. I think they've been really helpful. There was a pilot with groundfish that went around with the stock assessments. We were given a presentation at the beginning of this meeting and it was useful. We heard from the SSC that they found it useful, and this example showed that it actually had they been used it would have resulted in more favorable sigmas for two species. And it's just a reminder that these risk tables are designed to bring in more information, help us make better decisions, and that those decisions can go a multitude of ways. So again, I will be voting for this motion but did just want to voice my support, my ongoing support for these tools that can help us make better decisions overall like risk tables.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:01] Thank you. Kelly Ames.

Kelly Ames [00:23:05] Thanks Chair Hassemer. Just a question to the motion maker. So in your motion you have item number 1 along with the wording, suggestions, and items for removal found in the GAP Report. And I just wanted clarification that you're specifically referencing the items at the bottom of Page 1 of the GAP Report and the top of Page 2, but nothing else in that GAP Report?

John Ugoretz [00:23:39] Yes, thank you. Through the Chair, there are two subheadings in the GAP Report. One that says wording suggestions at the bottom of Page 1, and then it looks like the title items suggested for removal is also at the bottom of Page 1, but the two items bulleted are on the top of Page 2. There are separate recommendations following that that address the Council Member Letter to Secretary Lutnick that I am not including in this motion, nor does this motion include any recommendation to send that letter.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:25] Thank you. Other discussion? Not seeing any hands then I'll call the question on this motion. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:24:40] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:42] Opposed? Abstentions?

Ryan Wulff [00:24:47] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:50] The motion passes with abstention by Mr. Ryan Wulff, National Marine Fisheries Service. So with that I believe that completes task 1. The other task is to consider the Council Member Report. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:25:19] Thank you Chair Hassemer. I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:26] Let's hear it.

Jaime Diamond [00:25:29] I move the Council task Executive Director and staff to finalize H.2.a, Council Member Report 1 with the following changes reflective of advisory body reports and comments as follows. First, we would like to add cc'ing Mr. Soler. And then I'm just highlighting the specific changes, so this is not the whole document obviously. Under expand fisheries data collection, fund

long-term novel and innovative data collection to support robust fisheries and stock assessments, analysis, and methods to incorporate into future stock assessments, for example, eDNA. Provide funding pathways for commercial and recreational fishing community to collect data of opportunity or other data that could support fisheries management. Create better pathways for commercial, recreational, indigenous, and traditional fishing community knowledge and experiences to be incorporated into stock assessments and management. Add fund National Sea Grant College programming that supports domestic fishing ports and coastal communities. And then under the bullet of, support domestic infrastructure and modernization, under that first bullet expand and update port infrastructure, for example, ice houses, funding for port harbor dredging, adding including dock maintenance and fuel dock improvement and expansion. Seafood processing infrastructure, including incentivizing cold storage facilities near coastal fishing ports through the Port Infrastructure Development Program and the Water Resource Development Act. Support expansion of public markets that increase access to American seafood. Design coastal and marine spatial planning that supports and includes U.S. fishermen and processors. And then under design market industry support mechanisms, expand USDA programs for food producers, farms to fishermen, and processors, such as grants, insurance, and access to capital. Expand, here we changed from "strengthened" to "stronger", that was just a word change. Stronger NOAA fisheries marketing of primacy of U.S. fisheries management and how that contributes to a sustainable superior product. Another just, I believe it was like a typo word change, U.S. seafood commodity marketing, support at levels commensurate with agriculture sector, similar organizations to genuine Alaska pollock producers. Support, expand, and expedite funding for fisheries disaster declarations. Develop and expand educational efforts dedicated to the nutritional value of seafood and the health benefits of its consumption.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:39] Okay, thank you. Can we....so the highlighted parts are.....

Jaime Diamond [00:28:46] The highlighted portions are the changes and it's mostly additions. And those I can, do you want me to explain that now?

Pete Hassemer [00:28:54] Well, first we'll make sure it's all correct here. Can you scroll to the very top? Again, just so we're clear on what this directs. Directing the Executive Director and staff to finalize the letter with those changes. So, all the language on the screen that we saw is accurate and complete. Is that correct?

Jaime Diamond [00:29:19] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:20] Okay, with that is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Corey Ridings. Now please speak to your motion as needed.

Jaime Diamond [00:29:30] Thank you. So I went through the advisory body reports and I looked and compared what we already had in there. A lot of the recommendations may have been more specific but were covered under many of the items already in the letter. The changes that were made, some were just to fine tune, some were errors in including certain groups like processors in the.....let's see here, one, two, three, third bullet point here, adding indigenous and traditional fishing community knowledge as part of that. If you wouldn't mind scrolling down. It's mostly based on feedback from the letters. Nothing holistic, nothing changing the tone or anything of this letter in particular but just broadening some things, expanding the user groups that are affected specifically. And this really.....we just want to make sure that because in the previous motion that letter was very specific in nature, this kind of gives us a little more room to get into all of the things that we hear from industry, from stakeholders that affect fisheries beyond what happens here at the Council. And so in this letter, going to the Secretary of Commerce and cc'ing Mr. Soler, just bringing that to their attention, but these changes in particular were things that we felt worth doing. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:31:18] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on the motion? Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:00] Yes, thank you Chair, and thank you very much Miss Diamond for the proposal. I just want to make sure, there are three more bullets under national and then a section on international. Those are not in here because they are, there's no changes to them?

Jaime Diamond [00:00:15] Correct, this is only showing things that are being changed. This is not the whole letter.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:25] Thank you. Other questions for clarification? Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:28] Thank you Mr. Chairman. And so I see that you're essentially giving staff the discretion relative to any edits to the letter itself. I realize you're focusing here on the addendum to the letter. I am not in support of the letter itself as it's written. I think the tone is not quite appropriate and so I really don't have any heartburn with the things you're adding to the list, but I'm just troubled by the tone of the letter and will not be able to support it.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:20] Thank you. I think we're still making sure of clarifying the motion and I'm not seeing any hands for clarification so.

John Ugoretz [00:01:32] I'm sorry Mr. Chair, I have a request for clarification.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:35] Yep, I see that now. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:01:38] Thanks Mr. Chair. Thanks Miss Diamond for the motion. I just want to be clear on what the motion is asking because what I see in the first paragraph here is that we are tasking the Executive Director and staff with finalizing, however we are not recommending sending or submitting. So my question is was your intent to actually have this sent? And if so, on what timeline?

Pete Hassemer [00:02:11] Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:02:13] Thank you. That is an oversight. So the intent is to have this letter sent as soon as practicable. So would I need to make an amendment?

Pete Hassemer [00:02:32] No, I think with the stated intent that we're aware of timelines and you just stated that finalize the letter and send it as, I'm not sure of the exact words, as soon as practical is reasonable.

Jaime Diamond [00:02:49] Thank you. Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:52] That answer your question John?

John Ugoretz [00:02:55] Thanks, that did. I have some comments but save them for discussion.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:00] All right. Let's make sure we've got all the questions for clarification out of the way. I'm not seeing any, now we are into discussion on the motion. And now I see a hand up. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:03:23] Thanks Mr. Chair. And I do appreciate the work that went into crafting this list. I share some of the concerns about the cover letter to this list as well as the fact that it is unclear to me in this letter who is supposed to do this. It appears as though we are directing the National Marine

Fisheries Service to do these things or requesting that they do these things, and frankly, I don't know that they have the capability to do this list of things. Again, as with some of the recommendations to Council letter that we just approved, I feel that this list provides us a great background and guidance for future workload planning, but I am not supportive and will not support sending this.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:26] Thank you John. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:04:29] Thank you Chair. One thing I wanted to highlight is the really wide support for the letter from all the advisory bodies and some of the public commenters who cross a lot of our stakeholder groups. I saw support from both NGOs and industry. So across our entire spectrum of stakeholders we're supportive of sharing something like this back to the administration. I want to remind folks how this letter came about. When I was trying to prepare the motions for our last meeting, when we were trying to think of our initial response to the Executive Order, the conversations that I had with Council members started to elicit a lot of comments that were well outside of the bounds of what NOAA could handle. And there's this acknowledgement there, yes, the Executive Order said certain things, asked for certain things, but it became really clear really quickly that the Executive Order is really limited in the help that it could provide to industry. And there are all these other things that I think we, as stewards of the resource and as representatives of industry, can offer to tell the administration are necessary to support our stakeholders. So the spirit of the letter is to try to cover some of the things that are well beyond the purview of NOAA Fisheries to do. You guys asked who it was for. I heard shades of that in the comment. The intention is to flag that this is, that actually a whole of government approach is necessary to reach, to create seafood competitiveness for industry. So yeah, the stakeholders that I work with every day, the needs that they have are not limited to our body, they're well outside of us, and I think we end up coming up with these discussions all the time. We run up against this in our Council discussions that things that we need to affect are beyond our purview. I don't think that there's anybody else to say this to the government but folks like us who, groups like us who do this work that spans a lot of federal sectors. And so you know the....I didn't want the thoughts that came out of our initial ask for feedback around the EO to be lost. This is not intended as a tasking list. It's intended as a flag that here are other ways that we need help. Here are other things that we need to support us. And so yeah, and I understand and respect that some Council members might not like this approach, that's totally fine. We don't have to agree on everything. But I do want to highlight that a lot of your stakeholders did say that they were supportive. So I'll stop there.

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

Lynn Mattes [00:07:29] Thank you Chair. I've been pretty quiet on this agenda item. It's a little overwhelming and it's also a bit of an awkward place for a state agency on this one. The original asking for the matrix, et cetera, that was something that Council specifically asked for so I felt okay voting on that. I am likely going to abstain on this one because this, while I agree with the concept and what it's trying to do and trying to get additional information, I don't know that it's appropriate for me as a state agency representative to be a part of this or..... I'm having trouble explaining it, there's just a little bit of some sensitivity about being a state agency person trying to tell another, trying to a federal agency something. I appreciate all the work that's going into it and everything that it's trying to capture as far as the needs of our communities and our fishing industry, it's just an awkward spot for me. So just wanted to explain why I've been a little quiet and why I plan on abstaining. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:43] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:08:46] Thanks Chair. Thanks Miss Diamond for this motion. I plan to support it. I have a couple amendments if I may.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:03] Thank you.

Corey Ridings [00:09:12] Okay, thanks tower of power. Back up to the top under the first bullet, expand fisheries data collection, add a sub-bullet. Actually, you know what? I'm a slow reader. Let's double check that I might actually have missed them. Can you scroll down slowly to make sure it's not already in there? Okay, thank you. Yes, an extra bullet to read, "fund ecosystem data collection to understand impacts of a changing environment on target stocks, forage species, and protected species".

Pete Hassemer [00:10:13] You might need to repeat that.

Corey Ridings [00:10:14] Oh, I'm sorry. "on target stocks, forage species, and protected species". All right, and the second part is under the third bullet, design market slash industry support mechanisms, add a sub-bullet that says, "develop and support U.S. Seafood labeling". Okay, I stand to be corrected. Strike the, “develop and support U.S. Seafood labeling". And tower of power, can you go back up to the first part of this? I'm sorry. The sub-bullet that I added under expand fisheries data collection. So this one actually is a change, as Miss Diamond was noting as she explained her motion, however it's adding the term, "forage species" into this sentence. So we can either sort of leave this sentence or just highlight that the forage species is different.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:05] Can you just do that one in a different color or I suspect you'll be pasting it down there. And as they're typing we'll make sure we get this right. You're not adding a sub-bullet, you're adding two words to an existing item.

Corey Ridings [00:12:44] Exactly, I think it would be two words and a comma.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:21] We're getting there. Just get rid of that letter "A" in the first sentence. Okay Corey, it's your motion, does that all look correct and accurate? Complete and accurate?

Corey Ridings [00:13:41] It does, thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:13:43] Thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Jaime Diamond. Please speak to it as necessary.

Corey Ridings [00:13:50] Thanks Chair. This was recommended by the EAS. I thought it was a good suggestion. Brings into a lot of work that this Council has done historically on forage species and I think it fits well within the overall motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:08] All right, thank you. Any questions for clarification on this? I'm not seeing any questions? Discussion? Sorry. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:14:26] Thanks Mr. Chair. Question for Miss Ridings. Again, is the intent of your addition of this information that the letter is asking the National Marine Fisheries Service to fund this data collection?

Corey Ridings [00:14:46] Thank you Mr. Ugoretz. Yes, the intention is to fund data collection. I think that the National Marine Fisheries Service would be the natural place to do that. My understanding of the letter as a whole is that this is intended to go to the government as a whole, which is why it's directed at the Secretary of Commerce or why the recipient is the Secretary of Commerce. My understanding that NMFS is probably the group that collects most data on forage species, but there are certainly other agencies within the government that are collecting important ecosystem data, especially when it comes to understanding the impacts of a changing environment. So it's not meant to be exclusive of that, but

probably it would focus on that if I.....if I was in charge of the government that's what I would do.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:41] All right, thank you. Other questions? John, does that answer yours?

John Ugoretz [00:15:45] It does. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:45] All right, other questions? I'm not seeing any, discussion on the motion? I'm not seeing any hands for discussion then I'll call.....excuse me....

John Ugoretz [00:16:04] Thanks Mr. Chair, sorry. I know it's hard remote.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:09] Yeah, John go ahead, and then Rebecca Lent I think also had her hand up. John.

John Ugoretz [00:16:16] Yeah, thanks. Again, while I appreciate the intent behind capturing this information and our desires, this edit to the original motion is exactly why I don't support the motion as a whole or the amendment to the motion. I feel like there are a whole host of things that we could suggest that the government fund and it concerns me when we start to sound like we are directing the government to do things. Again, I think that this change to the existing motion is something that we should keep in our pocket as information to use moving forward when perhaps funding opportunities exist, but not something that we should be sending to the Secretary of Commerce.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:15] Thank you. Rebecca Lent did you have your hand up?

Rebecca Lent [00:17:17] Thank you Chair, I do. I know I keep saying this, but this was something that Sam Rauch asked us to do, said please do this, this is your opportunity. My understanding is the spirit of this second letter from Council members is to underscore those things that are beyond our direct mandate. It's not necessarily to direct, to fund, to whatever, but to highlight all these other things we need to do. We can't be 100% inclusive in this, and there are things we could nitpick on, there's nothing necessarily responsive to the HMSAS, but I understand that's very sensitive. I guess I would ask the Council this question, if we don't send this letter and we only send the other letter, if we get everything we want done in that first letter, has this Council been responsive to the Executive Order? I'm not sure we can say that we would be. We need to flag these things. The same way there are lots of other things I'd love to flag as you've heard from me earlier so. I also remind people that individually we can write letters, our stakeholders as well. I think it's important to reflect what we've heard from our hard working advisory bodies who really did put effort into this. I've been part of providing some comments on this for a number of weeks so I am going to support this. Thank you very much.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:49] Thank you. Further discussion? Not seeing any hands then, at this point we're voting on the amendment to the motion on the screen before us. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:19:06] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:09] Opposed.

John Ugoretz [00:19:14] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:15] Abstentions?

Sharon Kiefer [00:19:14] Abstain.

Ryan Wulff [00:19:15] Abstain?

Lynn Mattes [00:19:15] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:19] All right, let me make sure. Sharon, Ryan Wulff, Lynn Mattes abstained. Is that correct? Looking around I believe so. With that one no vote and three abstentions I'll check with the Executive Director, but I believe the motion has passed. That's correct. Thank you Corey for that. That will take us back to the main motion now as amended. Further discussion on that? Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:19:59] Yeah, I will keep it short. I will be supporting the motion. I think there has been a tremendous amount of, bordering on enthusiasm I guess I would say, from the public who have had the opportunity to really weigh-in about what it is that is impacting them, not just in the Council process, but in fisheries in general. And this came up when I had the opportunity to participate in the 5-year Catch Share Review. That was one of the first questions that was asked was, what do we do? How does the Council get involved in terms of weighing-in on things that are outside of our purview? I'm not going to speak to the tone of the letter, per se, because I am probably the gruffest one here at times in terms of tone, and I am not the one that's going to make the best judgment call on that one. But I would say that I don't believe that the intention in any way, shape, or form from the drafters of the letter was to be grating or in any other way difficult for whomever receives this letter. So I do just want to note that there are some additions from the HMSAS that did make it into there. I'm appreciative of the thought around things like infrastructure in ports. We talk a lot in this process around the importance of fisheries and fisheries science, but at the end of the day if we can't land those fish, if we don't have ice, if we don't have the ability to maintain those fish once we've caught and processed them in our coastal communities, we have a challenge there as well. So with that I will close my comments. Appreciate the discussion this morning and I'm grateful for everyone that has had an opportunity to weigh-in on this letter.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:10] Thank you. Vice-Chair Smith.

Butch Smith [00:22:13] Thanks Mr. Chair. This whole process is about directing somebody somewhere. Now we can change that word in directing to asking or help out with or whatever description words you want to use, but I will be supporting this and I don't....we can use the word "directing" and if that makes us scared. But I'm just befuddled. We have to ask for what we want and how to improve the system and I don't think this is anything other than what we do every day when we're at this Council asking somebody to model, somebody to do something, somebody to look at this, whether it be federal government, state government, tribal government, whatever, or the public, and so I will be supporting this motion. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:15] Thank you. Other discussion? Not seeing any, am I correct? Then I will call the question on the motion as amended. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:23:33] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:35] Opposed?

John Ugoretz [00:23:40] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:41] Abstentions?

Sharon Kiefer [00:23:41] Abstain.

Lynn Mattes [00:23:48] Abstain.

Ryan Wulff [00:23:48] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:48] Thank you. What I heard is a no vote from Mr. Ugoretz. Abstentions from Miss Kiefer, Miss Mattes, Mr. Wulff. The remainder were in favor of the motion. The motion passes. Thank you. And with that, let's go back to our check-in, Kelly. I'll give people a chance for any last discussion but first let's review the tasks. How are we doing?

Kelly Ames [00:24:31] Thank you Chair Hassemer. You have completed Council task number 1 as well as Council task number 2. I did have a question earlier during the Situation Summary overview and then later with a report from Mr. Wulff, he highlighted this Federal Register Notice that seeks input from the public which could include the Council. I think there had been some discussion about whether the Council Member Letter that you just voted on should also be submitted to that federal register data call. So just seeking some clarification there if you would also like that letter to go in response to the Federal Register Notice.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:17] All right, at this point it's directed to the Secretary of Commerce. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:25:24] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. Absolutely not. And if somebody wants to make that motion we can discuss it.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:34] All right. So far the intent is not to, or as Mr. Ugoretz stated, not to send it in as part of the Federal Register Notice. Other thoughts here? People in agreement with that? Do we need to discuss it a little more? Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:26:03] Thanks. Just to make sure I understand. We're talking about the Council member's letter as drafted it is to Secretary Lutnick.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:13] That's correct.

Rebecca Lent [00:26:14] And that has been adopted.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:16] Yes.

Rebecca Lent [00:26:16] Thank you Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:17] And the question now is would you like it also to be included as part of the Federal Register Notice submitted through that process? It's already going to Secretary Lutnick and Mr. Soler, Assistant Administrator. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:26:42] Thanks Chair. This is actually a question for Council staff. Has the Council before submitted documentation to the federal register? How often do we do that and if so what kind of materials were submitted?

Pete Hassemer [00:27:00] Executive Director Burden and then Ryan Wulff, I see your hand is up, we'll come to you. But first a question to the Executive Director.

Merrick Burden [00:27:09] Yeah, just a couple of remarks. Periodically we do submit comments in

response to calls to the public for public comments. It's my opinion we are not a member of the public. We have statutory responsibilities. It's also my opinion that the letter and direction we receive from the Secretary is the place for the Council to respond. So I think all of this is in response to the Executive Order. That would be my opinion as your Executive Director.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:43] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:27:48] Yes, thank you. And of course I'm here to defer to the Council on how it wants to respond. I just wanted to highlight that there is a number of things that were put in the motion and put in this letter that I think are very consistent with items that we are soliciting and put in the Federal Register. I'd also note the last paragraph on the first page of Eugenio's letter to the Council specifically references the Federal Register Notice and encourages the Councils to comment on the notice to the extent possible within the timeframe. So that is part of the request also from NMFS was to have the Councils to consider commenting on this Federal Register Notice. So that is something we don't always do, explicitly ask the Councils to do during a Federal Register Notice open comment period but have done in this case. So just wanted to explain that for the sake of your discussion. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:46] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:28:47] Yeah, I apologize. I'm confused. So I'm just going to ask a clarifying question and hopefully I'm the only one that's confused. We now have two letters. Are we talking about the first letter or are we talking about the second letter in terms of Federal Register?

Pete Hassemer [00:29:06] I will turn to Kelly Ames because she asked the question. I have a suspicion which it is, but Kelly please clarify.

Kelly Ames [00:29:16] Thanks Chair Hassemer. I was specifically referring to the Council Member Letter that you had addressed to Secretary Lutnick with a cc to Mr. Soler. There was a discussion previously about whether that letter could also be viewed in response to the Federal Register Notice that is in your supplemental materials.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:40] Is that clear?

Christa Svensson [00:29:42] Thank you Mr. Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:47] Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:00] Thank you Mr. Chairman. As I look at the call for information, you know there's several fairly specific bullets. While elements of some of these bullets are certainly, I think, mentioned in the Council Member Letter, I think that it's just not a cut and paste into the Federal Register. If the Council goes that direction I think there needs to be some more reorganization, perhaps even some more specificity relative to some of those bullets to really meet the nature of the call.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:39] All right. Ryan, your hand was still up. Also, Christa Svensson. Did you have something additional Ryan?

Ryan Wulff [00:00:47] Sorry about that.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:49] All right, Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:00:51] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I think in terms of the Council Member

Letter, I would be more comfortable not including it in the Federal Register. I think it is really a lot of information, but it is not directly tied specifically to what the requests are, whereas the first letter is. I will also note the first letter we had, with the exception of abstentions, many more Council members that were on board with the content of that letter and it is directly in alignment with it. I do think that it is important to send the letter to the appropriate parties and continue with raising awareness about all of the issues that are being faced by seafood and fisheries collectively, meaning not just commercial, but recreational, charter, everyone. But that is my initial inclination. Of course, people can convince me here on the floor, but I think my leaning at this point would be to not include it.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:13] Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:02:14] Thank you Chair. As someone who has had to respond to a lot of comments from the Federal Register, the things that you're asking for comments about has rarely limited what people tell you to respond about. So I don't think that we need to be like super beholden to what the set of questions were asked there. The response in general is to the Executive Order, and Ryan just said too that Eugenio's cover letter or whatever, Ryan I don't know what you were referring to, but he said that there was another letter that suggested that Councils specifically reach out in response to that. So I think that there were, I think there were a number of places where we were invited to share additional comment. The agency may or may not respond, and the Secretary of Commerce may or not respond to any of this, but I don't think that we're hiding anything by not submitting it to the Federal Register. I would love to hear what people fear might happen with submitting it to the Federal Register, but when we're ready for it I'm happy to make a motion to add it there so that we can vote on it. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:18] Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:03:22] Thank you Chair. Just quickly, in both cases I assume the letter will be in the public record. The question is, is it a different kind of public record? Is it easier to get to this letter if we submit it to the Federal Register? I'm also very interested in which destination is more likely to get us some kind of a written response. Thank you Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:03:44] Thank you, and there were some questions there. Ryan Wulff you have your hand up if you're answering those let's go ahead.

Ryan Wulff [00:03:51] Yep. This time I'm correctly using the hand function. So yes, in response to a couple of those comments, and Aja is correct, right? If you look at the, well first of all in response to Miss Szumylo's, I was referencing just Eugenio's May 6 letter, that's Attachment 3. It references the future Federal Register Notice which is now Supplemental Attachment 6. In the beginning of that, the Federal Register Notice says specifically that NOAA is launching an agency-wide effort to gather initial public input on implementation of the Executive Order. So as a whole, inviting feedback on fishery-related barriers, fishery management, science, and other priority needs in the order. And then we go into some specifics that we're looking for input on. But yes, you are correct Miss Szumylo, this is not....I mean we are only looking for input on those sub-bullets, we are looking at feedback on all of those broad issues as connected to the Executive Order. And then that's why Eugenio referenced the Councils could comment on that and encouraged them to do so in his May 6th letter, that's also referencing the separate item where he does want a Council response that is very specific to the unified agenda and tied more to the template and the matrix. So I hope that's clarifying based on the discussion. Any questions?

Pete Hassemer [00:05:16] Thank you for that explanation Ryan. Other discussion? I'm not sure exactly where we are on submitting this. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:05:34] Thank you. I'm happy to make a motion if folks would like to record their

preference.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:38] Go ahead.

Aja Szumylo [00:05:40] I will wing it. I move that the Council submit, I could use some help on how to refer to it, the Council Member Letter? The Council Member Letter to the Executive Order Federal Register Notice in response, or so sorry. Perhaps add seafood competitiveness in front of Executive Order.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:43] Kelly can be of assistance here.

Kelly Ames [00:06:47] Thanks Chair Hassemer, Miss Szumylo, I think you could also reference Supplemental Attachment 6, which has the Federal Register Notice to which you're speaking.

Aja Szumylo [00:06:57] Thank you. I appreciate that. I think that covers it.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:08] And I'm not going to pull it up, but Attachment 6, that Federal Register Notice is in response to that specific seafood competitiveness. I mean there's many Executive Orders. Okay. So Aja, it's your motion yet. Is what's on the screen accurate, complete?

Aja Szumylo [00:07:35] Thank you. That will work.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:36] All right, thank you. Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Please speak to your motion as needed.

Aja Szumylo [00:07:46] Thank you Chair. I don't need to say much here, but I appreciate the additional context that Ryan provided. So thank you Ryan for describing the broader intent of the Federal Register Notice and the call for information from the Council.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:00] Thank you. Any questions for clarification on this? Not seeing any questions, discussion on the motion? Not seeing any discussion. Hang on. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:08:25] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. I've got to say that I'm baffled at where we are going with this. This Council was asked to submit additional information. While I disagree with the information that we agreed or at least some of you agreed to submit, we are submitting that directly to the Secretary of Commerce. I don't see a need or a purpose in additionally submitting the exact same information to the Federal Register. I feel that it starts placing this Council in the role of the general public, and if we want that role we might as well not be a Council. We serve to do our duties that provide the information on things we have been charged with completing. We get amazing input from our advisory bodies and the public. We consider that input and we make recommendations on how to move forward with fisheries management. Separately, we were tasked by the President to respond to an Executive Order, which we have done or will be doing shortly, and we were requested through discussion with representatives of National Marine Fisheries Service to provide more information, which we are now planning to do as well. I cannot and will not support moving forward with also submitting this to a Federal Register Notice that we really have no role in.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:25] Thank you John. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:10:26] Thank you Chair. I don't... John, I appreciate your comments. I do just want to add, again, that we heard wide support from our advisory bodies from across the spectrum that the concepts included in this letter were important to them to share, and so it makes sense to me to share

them in as many ways that can be tracked. If we submit it directly to the Secretary of Commerce there's no guarantee that it will be attached to the Executive Order. This way it gets attached directly to it and I would love to see it go there. I do not see the harm in submitting it and I'll vote in support, well yeah, it's my motion, so thanks. Of course I'll support it.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:12] Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:11:13] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. I'm going to go with John here on this one I think. I think it's... I get where he's going and I agree with that. I think the people on the advisory bodies want to submit information that they can, but I get there's a relationship, he's kind of spelled it out here, and I'm inclined to go with John. I won't be supporting this motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:40] Okay, John your hand is up. Did you have additional discussion?

John Ugoretz [00:11:45] Thanks Mr. Chair, yes. Since it's been said multiple times that there was broad support for these actions and information in the letter, sure there was brought support, we often have broad support for items that this Council doesn't necessarily agree with. The simple fact that a lot of people want to do something doesn't always make it the right thing for us to do as a Council. Again, I still disagree with the letter itself, and certainly, as I said given our role, submitting it to the Federal Register.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:30] Further discussion? Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:12:40] Thank you Chair Hassemer. I'm just going to bring this up because I just want to be sure I'm capturing the nuance here. We've agreed to send the letter, and now we're talking about whether we send it directly to the Secretary of Commerce and through the public portal and how that comes across in our role as a Council, and I appreciate that if I'm understanding that's what we're talking about here. Then when I go back to Attachment 3, where this is the letter to the Executive Directors of the Regional Management Councils, and then go down to the bottom and the reference to the Federal Register and to the value of the input of the Councils and encourage the Councils to comment on the notice to the extent possible within the timeframe, and that they will provide an update on the public comments to inform efforts to implement the EO. And that's where I don't know if I'm being very literal, this is where we're being asked to provide our comment and maybe missing some of the nuance about why that is not a good idea? Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:16] Jaime Diamond and then Brad Pettinger, but I don't know if I should clarify, the first step the Council has directed staff to finalize this letter and send it to the Secretary of Commerce and cc Mr. Soler. That piece is done. Now it's this open or opportunity to comment on a Federal Register request. So Jaime first then Brad.

Jaime Diamond [00:14:55] Correct, thank you Chair Hassemer. I was going to just kind of distinguish what you just said, but also echo that Mr. Soler explicitly asked for it. So yeah, I have the same kind of.... I feel like I must be missing something because I'm reading what he's asking and I'm just trying to understand the nuance, and being the new guy at the table here, maybe I'm, yeah I'm just struggling with the difference because it's explicitly asked for.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:37] Let me make sure. So John Ugoretz has your hand up, but I had Brad Pettinger in the queue first. Brad, then John.

Brad Pettinger [00:15:46] Yeah, I think kind of a parable here might be putting things in context. We're the Council and we have the, we have the equivalent of the cell phone to the Secretary of

Commerce and we're asking, sounds to me we're going to do that, we're going to call him, but we're also going to call up the Secretary of Commerce on their public line and get in line with everybody else. We've already got the straight connection. Why are we going through?.....I don't understand what the purpose of the Federal Register Notice is when the information's already getting to the people that asked for it. That's kind of my.....that's the way I see this. So anyway, I'll stop.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:46] Thank you. John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:16:50] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And in addition to what Mr. Pettinger just said, I point not to what was requested to us in the Secretary's letter, but what was presented to us in our briefing book and how this Council Member Letter was described in the Situation Summary, which is as sending a letter to Secretary Lutnick. It does not say in the briefing book that the proposal of this Council Member Letter was to have it be responsive to the Federal Register Notice. Had we discussed that I think some of the votes on that letter might have been different, but it's not what we voted on. And so we're looking at a different thing now and Council staff have raised the question and now we have a motion asking us to also do something quite different than what was asked of us and I do not think it's appropriate. Honestly, I think we are looking like fools and we should just stop this now.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:17] All right, thank you for that. We have a motion on the floor. So that is expressing the Council's intent here. In response to what John said about the notice and the Situation Summary, there is a Federal Register Notice for comment. There is nothing, my understanding is there is nothing that....to prevent us from commenting on that, so we can move in that direction but I stand to be corrected if that is not correct. Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:18:59] Thanks Chair. I hesitate to belabor this. I am just thinking about the question I actually asked earlier, how often the Council submits things through the Federal Register. And just I was reflecting on Mr. Pettinger's comments about sort of a direct line versus a public line, and I appreciate that, that's helpful to think about this. So I'm thinking to just like a few things that I happen to know. I think we submit like our marine planning letters, those go to the Federal Register. And I'm just wondering if Council staff would be willing to provide a little more texture information about the types of letters that we have submitted to the Federal Register just to get a better sense if this fits in that category.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:47] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:19:49] Yes, thank you. Let's see, as I think back on the letters we've sent in to various agencies over the years since I've been ED, the most frequent set of letters that we were sending over that time period were in response to wind energy. And those letters, as I recall, responded to both direct requests to us, and then I think there were also public calls for comment periods, and we responded to those public calls for information because we didn't have a statutory responsibility in that case. We were commenting directly to BOEM as through their public call. There are other types of letters that we send on EFH quite regularly, and we are statutorily obligated to comment on other agency actions that may affect EFH. And sometimes it's difficult to figure out what the angle is to get our comments across, but we have often, at least since I've been around, tried to direct those directly to the head of the agency. So it's a mix and it depends on what our role is in that issue that's being debated and whether we have the statutory hook or not. Does that help your question Miss Ridings?

Pete Hassemer [00:21:19] Thank you. Other discussion? Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:21:25] Thanks. I also had one last thing from my personal experience with other Councils too. But when I was in New England, for example, there were times when the agency had

published a Federal Register Notice for rulemaking and the Council wrote in to comment directly to the agency on the rulemaking itself to talk through something that they saw written in the rule. So I don't think that there is a bounds for, it's the Federal Register, it's open public comment, and so truly any entity can submit information to it and then the agency gets to choose what to do with it. So again, I don't see the harm here, but I respect everybody's right to disagree with me.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:10] John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:22:13] Yeah, thanks Mr. Chair. And to be clear, I'm not saying that this Council can't submit information to Federal Register Notices. I'm saying that in this case we shouldn't. We have a direct line with an open door to send a letter that, regardless of whether I agree with its contents, is being sent. And we should avail ourselves of that open door and not belabor the issue by submitting it somewhere else where it's really not within what we're trying to do. When I was pointing to the briefing book, I was pointing to how this Council was reviewing information presented to us, not stating that that prevented us from doing something. But again, the discussion surrounding the letter was based on what we thought its intent was. And I just, I'm somewhat baffled as to where we are right now, but obviously I don't support this.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:14] All right, thank you. I've heard a lot of discussion, people expressing either their support or non-support for this item. I don't know if there's more information that could come forward that would help you in making that decision. Unless there's other discussion here, I'm going to go ahead and call the question on this. The motion is before you. I think it's very clear. Should the Council submit this to that Federal Register Notice? All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:24:00] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:03] Opposed?

Council [00:24:04] No.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:05] Abstentions?

Lynn Mattes [00:24:09] Abstain.

Ryan Wulff [00:24:10] Abstain.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:14] Executive Director Burden would you please do a roll call vote on this motion?

Merrick Burden [00:24:24] Certainly Mr. Chairman, just give me one moment here. Okay, this.....we almost got through the meeting without a roll call vote. Let's see, I'm working from Voting Sheet Number 1. The motion reference here is H.2 Number 3, which was originally moved by Miss Aja Szumlyo. Starting from the top, John Ugoretz.

John Ugoretz [00:24:57] No.

Merrick Burden [00:25:00] Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:25:04] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:25:04] Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:25:07] Abstain.

Merrick Burden [00:25:09] Butch Smith.

Butch Smith [00:25:11] Yes.

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

Brad Pettinger [00:25:16] No.

Merrick Burden [00:25:17] Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:25:20] No.

Merrick Burden [00:25:20] Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:25:23] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:25:23] Heather Hall.

Heather Hall [00:25:28] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:25:28] Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:25:31] No.

Merrick Burden [00:25:31] David Sones.

David Sones [00:25:34] No.

Merrick Burden [00:25:35] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:25:35] Abstain.

Merrick Burden [00:25:38] Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:25:41] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:25:41] Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:25:52] No.

Merrick Burden [00:25:52] And Mr. Chairman you have the opportunity to cast the tie-breaking vote. You don't necessarily need to cast it.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:03] Chair votes yes.

Merrick Burden [00:26:06] Okay, the motion passes.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:16] Thank you. With that, Kelly you started this off with a question about any place else you want to send the letter?....(laughter).....or how are we doing here?

Kelly Ames [00:26:39] Thank you Chair Hassemer. Your work on this agenda item is done.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:45] All right, thank you. With that, I'm going to close out this agenda item. I need to do a time check here. I think it's been about an hour and a half since we've come back. Let's take a 10-minute break. When you come back Vice-Chair Smith will have the gavel and we will proceed with our fiscal matters.....(REVISIT)

Butch Smith [00:27:14] We have a clarification before we go to administrative matters. Executive Director.

Merrick Burden [00:27:22] Yes, thank you Mr. Vice Chairman and Council members. And my sincerest apologies about this remark I'm about to make. I don't think we needed to make the other agenda item any more difficult, but turns out I did the tally incorrectly. I mistakenly put Miss Sharon Kiefer in as an abstention and her vote was a no. So the vote actually failed. And even though Mr. Hassemer voted, that brought it to a tie and a tie vote fails. So my apologies for that confusion. Our record is clear. There's nothing more for us to do, but just want everyone to have that clarity.

Butch Smith [00:28:03] Thank you Mr. Director for the clarification on that. I don't think there's any questions that need to be, but if there is, any questions on that? All right.

I. Administrative Matters

1. Fiscal Matters

Butch Smith [00:00:00] Are there any questions of the report? Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:06] Thank you with a cucumber in my mouth, I apologize.

Butch Smith [00:00:09] I hear that's going to happen a lot, I think.

Rebecca Lent [00:00:11] The staff position we're referring to in this report, is that the HMS?

Butch Smith [00:00:15] Go ahead.

Merrick Burden [00:00:21] I appreciate the question Mrs. Lent. Well, if you have thoughts to the contrary please let me know, but where my head is at the moment is that we do have a vacant staff officer position. A lot of folks have linked that to Kit Dahl's retirement and have logically said, well maybe that's the HMS position. We have Kerry Griffin playing that role now. We also have had many retirements here over the last couple of years, one of whom was our long time economist. And as I look around at the, sort of the position of this administration, the direction that you all are headed at the Year-At-A-Glance and the issues that you have coming down the pike, and some other statements that you've made about the desire for more social science, my intention is to fill that position with someone who has some expertise in economics and social science, sorry, I don't have a cucumber but I have other lunch problems, someone with some expertise in economics and social science. So that's where my head is at the moment.

Butch Smith [00:01:32] Dr. Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:01:32] Thank you for that clarification. And I just want to again reiterate how much the folks working on HMS and the FIW really appreciate contractor Katie Westfall. She's doing a tremendous job and I hope that she can be kept on with the budget as planned. Thank you.

Butch Smith [00:01:54] Yes.

Merrick Burden [00:01:54] Yeah, thank you for that comment. I'm also a big fan of Miss Westfall's and we do have the budget through 26', a good chunk of 26' contemplates keeping her as a contractor.

Butch Smith [00:02:10] Any other comments? I would like to say.....oop, go ahead.

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:16] I'm sorry Mr. Vice-Chair, just whenever it's appropriate after comments I do have a motion.

Butch Smith [00:02:22] I would just like to make one comment and then I'll....I'd like to say that, you know, we last few years have been some trying times to keep this Council funded and keep what we do. And I think there's a big thank you to the Budget Committee, which Chairman Pete was Chairman I think of, and Brad and everybody that worked on that, Patricia, and a big kudos to our Executive Director. I'm not saying we're out of these hard times, but they seem to be a little bit better and there's a little more light through the end of the tunnel. So I wanted to thank you guys personally for that, and I know the Council members do too and appreciate the hard work and brain power that went into doing what you guys did to get us through. So thank you for all that hard work. And now Miss Sharon you

have the floor.

Sharon Kiefer [00:03:24] Mr. Vice-Chair, I do have a motion if the tower of power could pop that up. I move the Council adopt a final calendar year 2025 operation budget of $5,926,734 as recommended in Agenda Item I.1.a, Supplemental Budget Committee Report 1, which includes planning for an in-person November 2025 meeting and also providing guidance that the Executive Director has discretion on the timing of filling the vacant staff officer position, particularly if budget uncertainties exist.

Butch Smith [00:04:13] Sharon does your motion on the screen reflect what you said and accurate.

Sharon Kiefer [00:04:22] Yes Mr. Vice Chair, it does.

Butch Smith [00:04:28] Okay. Can I get a second to that motion, please? Pete Hassemer seconds the motion. You want to speak to your motion, please?

Sharon Kiefer [00:04:43] Mr. Vice-Chair I am not a member of the Budget Committee, but I did attend the Budget Committee. A good robust discussion. Very good news to hear that we had received the final funding allocation and I felt that the recommendation to, you know we've been operating under a provisional calendar year 2025 budget, so it was a reasonable expectation to finalize our 2025 operational budget. We were all happy to hear the recommendation for a full in-person November meeting and certainly hope to see movement soon on the new staff member. So that speaks to my motion.

Butch Smith [00:05:27] Okay, any questions on the motion? Seeing none, any Council discussion? All right seeing none I'll call for the question. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

Council [00:05:47] Aye.

Butch Smith [00:05:47] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes. And that closes.....oh, I'm sorry, Patricia have we done our, have completed our work?

Patricia Hearing [00:06:05] You have and I'll see you in November.

Butch Smith [00:06:07] All right, thank you.

2. Approve Council Meeting Record

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] We are going to move on with Agenda Item I.2, approval of the meeting record. And that's just me so I'll look around and see if there's anything here? It takes a motion. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:26] Mr. Chairman, when the time is appropriate I have a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:30] This is the appropriate time.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:33] There we go. I move the Council approve the Council meeting record for the 282nd session, June 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:44] Thank you. That language on the screen appears accurate, complete. Do you agree?

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:50] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:00:50] Is there a second to it? Seconded by Brad Pettinger. Speak to your motion as needed.

Sharon Kiefer [00:00:57] We heard no alternative edits or comments regarding the record so my intent is I believe we should adopt it.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:08] All right, any questions on it? Discussion on the motion? Seeing none I will call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:01:17] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:01:21] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. That completes our action under that item.

3. Membership Appointments and Council Operating Procedures

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] There is no public comment so we can move directly into our Council tasks. And first of all I want to look around and see if there's any discussion before we start, but we'll proceed one by one through these. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:00:22] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Since this is an opportunity for discussion, I'm just noting in the Situation Summary the plan for should we approve edits to COP 20, notably that would create divergence across the Council COPs, and that the suggestion here in the SitSum is that it would be appropriate to task staff to incorporate these revisions into a final set of COP revisions to ensure clarity and consistency across all COPs. As the SitSum reads, it says these final COPs would be brought back for final adoption at a future meeting. I'm a little concerned with the comment that I just heard Rebecca make that it would just be an automatic. EFP processes can and do differ between FMPs for good reason. I realize that many of the changes that we're looking at in COP 20 here today are technical in nature and making corrective cleanups and bringing things up to date to be within current standards and that's well and good but I'm, I think, uncomfortable with kind of the assumption that we would just be adopting a one-size-fits-all for all EFPs. The groundfish EFP process and how that intersects with our specifications process is very complex and requires multiple steps. And so I just want to put that out here now because I'm a little concerned that there is just an assumption that we're just, that the FIW is speaking for all FMPs, and I don't believe that's the case. So thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:24] Thank you. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:02:27] Yeah, thank you for your concern. I'm going to just step up here for a second based on the conversation I've had with some of the FIW members, certainly not all of them, but in working through this and in making these recommendations the intent on this really has been around providing a short-term solution so that we can come back, have the full robust discussion. This is not meant to be something that goes in perpetuity. I am prepared to speak about how we handle any derivatives, I guess I would say, for other COPs in terms of guidance I would recommend we give to our Executive Director and potentially our Council staff. But I do not believe that it was the intention to have the FIW take a broad paintbrush and swipe every EFP today in this process. Now long-term, and we heard a little bit about this under Agenda Item H.1 in terms of, hey, maybe we can take the lessons we've learned from the FIW and apply them to other EFP processes. We may end up through this work, and again I'll just encourage everybody to show up tomorrow and at future FIW meetings to be able to take this work and apply it where applicable. I think there will always be some variations in how our EFPs work and operate, but there are also some kind of general language terms that may be beneficial, such as having an application that people apply with. So I'll pause there, and see your finger is up.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:25] Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:04:27] Thank you Mr. Chair. Now I'm even more concerned. A suggestion that other teams should just dial into the FIW and participate in that process to ensure that their EFP processes and other FMPs will be considered by the FIW isn't where I think we should be going. I'm feeling like, and I'm not seeing it here on the SitSum per se, I'm seeing that we will consider tasking staff with incorporating all or some of the FIW proposed revisions to COP 20, which is specific to the HMS EFPs. If there is... I'm now growing concerned that maybe we don't want to be taking those edits and just automatically plopping them into the other COPs for consideration because the scoping process didn't involve representatives from other FMPs. So I'm just flagging that as a point of concern. And so I think the issue of whether we want to bring back other COPs for consideration at a future meeting and

whether we want staff to be spending time working on incorporating the HMS COP modifications, that's a different discussion, and I'm not seeing that as an action item under our Council tasks, but I'd suggest that maybe we need to consider that separately.

Pete Hassemer [00:06:08] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:06:10] Thank you Chair. I'm getting concerned that we are at times duplicating efforts that are important in some places, and that we're using, we're spending a lot of time in this process. We spent a lot time earlier on something that I don't think that we needed to spend as much time as we should have on, and I don't want to do that when we don't have to. I agree with your concerns about differences between the FMPs, but I do want to be reasonable and judicious about spending time to do things that make sense. I don't have specific comments about it right now. I just wanted to offer that, that additional concern to what you were mentioning. I do want to just highlight a little bit more what Christa mentioned, that we all voted under Agenda Item H.1 to move forward with looking at some of the potential crossover between revisions and some COPs with others. So while there are elements that differ between them, I do think that we need to look for efficiencies when we can. I'm not saying to change things that are really critical about the specifications process, for example, or how that's incorporated there. I don't think that's ever the intent, but there are some edits here that are like, clarifying authority for example, that are really easy to cross over without spending a lot of time rehashing across our advisory body groups at high cost to our entire process. So I just want to air that there. I think we're trying to tend towards being more efficient and so I want to reserve concern for where it matters and at other points when efficiency is possible let it go. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:56] Thank you. Executive Director Burden wants to weigh-in, then Rebecca Lent. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:08:01] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. In the interest of trying to help clarify some of our thinking as staff when we were looking at this and some of the language that made its way into the SitSum that you just referenced Miss Yaremko, we use the word consistency. And as we were talking about that internally, we were mostly talking about consistency of terminology. And so I fear we may have confused the issue a little bit. I do think the issues that you've raised are really germane to what we're trying to do with our special projects, which is what can we learn from the FIW and translate that in some way over to our other FMPs and become more efficient. And so as I look at the Year-At-A-Glance here over the next few meetings, we have a place in April where I think having that conversation makes sense where we can bring back something that might be a side-by-side where it says, here are our different EFP processes, here's what we've learned from the FIW, and is there a way to translate that to CPS and groundfish, for example. So maybe that thinking helps just to think how we would step through this and to clarify what we were thinking when we thought of the term consistency.

Pete Hassemer [00:09:19] Rebecca Lent.

Rebecca Lent [00:09:19] Thank you Chair. And I apologize for starting this brush fire. My intent was that there are certain things like it's not experimental, it's exempted. It's not must, it's should. It's not application, it's proposal. Those types of things. And I just wanted to flag it because in our discussions in the FIW, as I recall, there was an admission that yeah, this is something that really needs to be updated in the other COPs. But certainly not the HMS folks going to be doing that. So thank you for raising the issue and I apologize for leading us down this trail, but good that we're talking about it. Thank you Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:03] All right, thank you. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:10:05] Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Taking this discussion on its face, I appreciate that what we might see in an upcoming set of proposed revisions to other COPs would be, if I'm understanding correctly, would be completely technical clarifying changes for consistency and accuracy. Is that what I'm understanding?

Pete Hassemer [00:10:34] I will look to either the Executive Director or Kelly for confirmation on that. Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:10:42] Thanks Miss Yaremko. Can you repeat your question?

Marci Yaremko [00:10:46] So as I understand it, we want to, we want to build efficiencies, we want take what was done in this FIW review process and apply it to other COPs to bring them, to make them consistent using consistent terminology, making other technical changes that are necessary. I don't know how else to explain it, but are not changes to content or process I guess is where I'm trying to understand because I'm hearing things that.....I'm comfortable with what I've heard around the table in terms of discussion and intent that we bring the other COPs up to snuff, but again, I want to make sure that we aren't embarking on a more comprehensive or holistic review of each EFP process until we have an opportunity to receive that side-by-side comparison that you reference later next year.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:02] Kelly.

Kelly Ames [00:12:05] Through the Chair, yes Miss Yaremko you've got it right.

Marci Yaremko [00:12:12] Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:12:14] All right, thank you. Any other maybe higher level discussion items here before we start into our task list? And not seeing any then let's proceed starting at the top. The first is getting feedback from the Council on Chair's appointments. We had vacant positions on the Budget Committee. Mr. Brad Pettinger was serving on the Budget Committee by virtue of his prior position as Chair of the Council. No longer being Chair he wasn't on the committee, but I've asked him to, would like to ask him to sit on that committee to fill the Oregon seat then that he was also sitting in there. And there was a position vacated by Mr. Marc Gorelnik who has termed out in his Council duties, and I have asked Jaime Diamond to step in and fill that seat on the Budget Committee. So I just want to look around and see if everybody is good with those appointments? And the other one is the Legislative Committee, and again there was a vacancy created there with the expiration of Mr. Gorelnik's service. At this point I looked over the composition of the Legislative Committee and I would like to leave it as it is. We have a good number of very good people serving on that. I don't feel it's necessary to task any other Council members with serving on that committee unless there's a great desire for someone to do that. But at this point I will leave the Budget Committee as it's currently populated and as it shows in our roster if that's okay? And looks like we're okay to proceed in that direction so I thank you for that. The second item, appoint one tribal GAP member. Kelly Ames had covered that in the Situation Summary. So what have we here on that? David Sones.

David Sones [00:14:42] Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do have a motion. I think Kelly's prepared for me to nominate to the tribal seat. If we could have that up.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:54] All right, we're ready for that motion.

David Sones [00:15:00] Thank you. Okay, I move the Council appoint Mr. Steve Hines to the Tribal position on the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:12] All right, that's pretty easy. It all looks accurate and complete.

David Sones [00:15:15] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:16] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Sharon Kiefer. Please speak to your motion.

David Sones [00:15:22] Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes, this is a good choice. We had a hard time finding somebody that was seriously interested in this but Mr. Hines brings a lot of experience for his age. He's fished in Alaska in the pollock fishery. He's fished in our tribal longline and hake fisheries and has a good knowledge of the groundfish issues. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:15:49] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? Not seeing any I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:15:58] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:02] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you David. Next is one At-Large SSC member. Sharon Kiefer.

Sharon Kiefer [00:16:20] Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an appointment and I believe Kelly has a motion.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:29] I believe you might have a motion.

Sharon Kiefer [00:16:31] Well I have a.....there we go. I move the Council appoint Dr. Aaron Berger to the At-Large position on the Scientific and Statistical Committee.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:44] And again, that looks accurate and complete?

Sharon Kiefer [00:16:46] Yes it does.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:47] Is there a second? Seconded by Lynn Mattes. Speak to your motion as needed.

Sharon Kiefer [00:16:53] Put my glasses on for that. Mr. Chairman I believe Dr. Berger will be a valuable addition. He's had prior service on the SSC. He brings a diversity of experience, including stock assessment, bioeconomic models, and is known as a great communicator. I also note that he served on the Joint Technical Committee for the Pacific Hake Whiting Treaty. And again, I think that's valuable experience he'll bring to the committee.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:21] Thank you. Any questions regarding the motion? Discussion on the motion? Not seeing any I will call the question. Those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:17:34] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:17:37] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you Sharon. All right, we are up to number 4. The proposed revisions to Council Operating Procedure number 20. Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:02] Thank you Chair. Before we move on to that, I have a sort of non-update

update on the vacant ODFW CPSMT position.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:11] Sure, let's do that.

Lynn Mattes [00:18:13] We haven't made a plan yet. We know it's vacant. We do have somebody filling in through November. And after the November meeting we will try to develop a plan on how to fill that position permanently. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:25] All right, thanks. Appreciate that update. Okay, now Operating Procedure 20. Christa Svensson.

Christa Svensson [00:18:40] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I have a motion when the folks in the back are ready.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:47] There it is on the screen. Go ahead.

Christa Svensson [00:18:51] Thank you. I move the Council adopt changes found in proposal revisions to Council Operating Procedure 20, protocol for consideration of Exempted Fisheries Permit for highly migratory species fisheries, Agenda Item I.3, Attachment 3, September 2025.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:10] All right, that language on the screen looks accurate and complete?

Christa Svensson [00:19:14] Yes.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:14] Is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Please speak to your motion.

Christa Svensson [00:19:20] Yeah, thank you. Firstly, I separated the motion from the guidance that was requested by Council staff and our Executive Director because I thought it would simplify what the intention of the FIW was, which was to focus on HMS, EFPs, and scoping. And I'll start by saying firstly, thanks to everyone who has been participating and working in the FIW meetings for the copious amount of work that has been done at really a large number of meetings. And we did take up the Council's charge to make edits to COP 20 in terms of the timing of EFP proposals reviewed, as exampled in November and March, providing the opportunity for the Council to make recommendations on EFP applications in a single meeting, and accepting EFP applications for Council review at either of the two meetings proposed. In doing so there was a large amount of discussion as to whether the guidance on application submissions and requirements is clear in time for this November meeting, and if we were to stick with just the surgical approach to the COP as prescribed if it would work for us. And though the FIW recognized that the additional work being undertaken by the FIW would again reopen the COP at a later date, we ultimately decided that we needed to add some additional clarifications that were necessary in interest of making the EFP process more accessible to fishermen in the short term. If this motion is adopted it would strengthen the work underway with the cross FMP Agenda Items H.1 and potentially H.2, adaptive management, and Council responses to Executive Order. I am going to put in a little bit of guidance in terms of my rationale around this just so that we have that on the record. My recommendation would be in accepting the edits as found in Attachment 3. The Council shall allow staff to make editorial changes if necessary to ensure consistency with other sections of COPs and regulations. The intent of this guidance would be to take the FIW recommendations and apply them across the other COPs when it comes to EFP regulations that might include modifying the FIW recommendations at an editorial level rather than substance. So the intention here would be to simplify potential workload for staff and ensure consistency and clarity across the various sections of COPs, relevant regulations and other factors. Final COPs would be brought back

for final Council adoption at a future meeting. And in closing, I'm looking forward to continuing to work with FIW members Thursday and Friday of this week so we can prepare for a substantive update on performance goals and metrics at the November Council meeting. And we'll continue to discuss broader COP 20 improvements over the winter with those changes currently targeted for the March Council meeting.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:32] Thank you Christa. Questions for clarification on the motion? I'm not seeing any questions. Discussion on the motion? And not seeing any hands for discussion then I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:22:58] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:58] Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. Thank you. Christa, go ahead.

Christa Svensson [00:23:08] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. I know that I did not provide written guidance in my motion. I am curious, this is a point for our Executive Director I think, if it would be beneficial to provide my comments to staff just so you have that in writing in addition to the verbal record.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:26] Well they will be part of the transcripts, but Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:23:31] Thank you. At the risk of answering a question with another question, I think the conversation that we had here on the floor is clear to me about what we would be intending to do as we move forward with any of the edits that we make and that they are consistent in the form of grammar and terminology. If there's more to it that you were planning to provide via guidance, that'd be welcome, but I think I'm clear as long as everyone else here is clear, and Kelly especially.

Christa Svensson [00:24:00] Thank you. That was my intention was not to go wild by any means, but just trying to simplify and make things convenient for yourself and your staff.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:15] All right, anything else under task number 4 there before we move on? And I'm not seeing any so number 5, revisions to Operating Procedure number 27. Looking around. Let me jump back here, that's the process for initiating allocation reviews. Anybody willing to take a shot at this? Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:25:13] Thank you Mr. Chair. I move the Council adopt the revisions to COP 27. I guess it would be as shown in I.3, Attachment 4.

Pete Hassemer [00:25:53] Okay, fairly simple. Looks accurate, complete. Okay, is there a second to the motion? Seconded by Rebecca Lent. Please speak to your motion as needed.

Marci Yaremko [00:26:08] Just a thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:11] All right, questions regarding the motion? No questions, discussion on the motion? There's no discussion so I'll call the question. All those in favor say "Aye".

Council [00:26:25] Aye.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:28] Opposed? Abstentions? That motion passes unanimously. And back to our task list. More importantly back to Deputy Director Kelly Ames.

Kelly Ames [00:26:51] Thank you Chair Hassemer. You have completed your actions under this agenda item. You appointed Mr. Steve Hines as a Tribal representative to the GAP, and Dr. Aaron Berger to the At-Large seat on the SSC. Welcome those two individuals to our process. I will be sending a letter to them but I'm sure it's a letter you will all agree with. And you also adopted the proposed revisions to COP 20 and COP 27.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:24] All right, and give me one second here. Mr. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:27:32] Thanks, sorry to take up just one more second, but since it wasn't a task, I just wanted to take a moment to comment. I appreciated the AS noting the long-standing tenure of David Hogan. He will definitely be missed. And just to note that Mr. Colin Brinkman, looking forward to working with him also in this venue. For those that don't know, he has been an alternate head of delegation to the IATTC working closely with me and with our delegation there and I think he'll bring some valuable experience, and I know he's looking forward to joining an upcoming Council meeting in the near-term here in-person so you all will get to meet him. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:12] Thank you Ryan. Marci Yaremko.

Marci Yaremko [00:28:15] Thank you Mr. Chair. Before we close out this agenda item I just wanted to think ahead a little bit to November. I know we have scheduled under salmon a meeting or an agenda item to discuss the report out of the Klamath River Workgroup. And just wanted flag now here in September before we take that content and discussion up that CDFW has concerns about this workgroup and has, I guess, wants to maybe consider if the work is going to continue to be productive. We have some concerns on our side about continuing to staff it, some challenges there and our ability to participate is, I think, growing more difficult. So it seemed kind of at the last meeting that progress had somewhat stalled and it might be worth us considering what to do looking ahead if perhaps we're thinking about pausing the group, or anyway just considering its future and whether we're going to continue to make progress. So just flagging that now looking ahead to November. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:29:56] All right, thank you. Appreciate the early notice there. No action to be taken today. Aja, I think I saw you raising your hand and then I believe Mr. Chris German. Aja.

Aja Szumylo [00:30:10] This is not terribly important, but I went to high school with Colin Brinkman and we graduated together so I just wanted to....he's like a very old friend and it's funny to re-encounter him in fish world now.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:24] You never know where you're going to meet people. Chris German.

Chris German [00:30:29] I just want to let you know that I passed along the HMSAS comments to Dave Hogan and he got back to me and in true Dave fashion he said, I do appreciate that, thanks. Much better than good riddance. So that's Dave's response back.....(laughter)..... I thought you'd all appreciate his responses. He's enjoying his cabin in West Virginia, so with that.

Pete Hassemer [00:30:52] All right, thank you. Any other comments, discussion before we close out this agenda item? Not seeing any hands then our work is complete on this agenda item.

4. Future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning

Pete Hassemer [00:00:00] That completes all our reports, public comment, so I will then open this up for discussion and maybe first turn to Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:00:13] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate all of the comments from all the different advisory groups. Just a couple of thoughts as I was jotting down some notes during the comments that we received. Let's see, if we start first with the November meeting. We are quite full in November and I heard a few requests for adding things to the November agenda, so we do have a spare hour on Sunday. That is about it, so we'll have to be pretty diligent in terms of what we add if we add anything at all. We also have....that hotel, it's the same one we were at last year, there's another conference that's occurring simultaneously to us and so we are quickly running out of hotel meeting space, so it'll be hard to bring more folks in-person in November than we have scheduled. We have used spillover hotels before, if you're really interested in bringing more people in-person. But capacity on both space and time is an issue in November at this point. Let's see, we look at the Year-At-A-Glance summary, I did hear several groups making note of being in-person at other different times of the year, so you know there are some major work we're trying to do on our HMS FMP, for example, and at the same time we're trying to adhere to our Council efficiencies decisions about how many times we bring people in-person and so I did hear an exchange from Miss Svensson and some of the HMS representatives about being in-person for the HMS Roadmap agenda topic and so that raises the question of if that's going to be in-person, do we schedule it for March or June? When do we want to have the HMS groups in-person? I think at this point our budget realities are still what they were a year ago and two years ago and having as frequent in-person meetings as we did a handful of years ago just probably not in the cards, but I think with some diligence we can get to where people want to go. Let's see, I think I'll just stop there Mr. Chairman and I think Council discussion, unless there are questions that I'm happy to keep entertaining, but other than that I think Council discussion would be appropriate.

Pete Hassemer [00:02:44] Let's just combine those two questions in discussion. Sharon Kiefer then Lynn Mattes.

Sharon Kiefer [00:02:53] I certainly recognize that the agenda is full and evidently the hotel is as well, but I was particularly struck by Dr. Heppel's observation of how many new members on the Habitat Committee who have never been in-person to a Council meeting and I see that they are scheduled in April but just I'm not sure why it's April instead of November or if it's flip-flopping with other committees, but if we truly are a Council family I think it helps them to meet the family and just didn't know, I heard you mention something about sometimes we use other nearby hotels, conference rooms, and rooms and so forth, that certainly still allows them to come over to our hotel to interact for things such as the Chairman's Reception, to actually watch open session of the Council, things like that. So just wondering what the thoughts would be about that, but what really struck me was the fact that several new members who've never been to an in-person Council meeting.

Pete Hassemer [00:04:08] Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:04:08] Yeah, thank you for the question and your concern. I guess more of a concern about keeping people together, and I share that concern and I'm seeing fingers pointing so I'll just keep going, how about I just keep going? So let's see, in terms of the Habitat Committee, that is a very large committee. We have had meetings where people have stayed in other hotels. That is a big lift for us, especially this close. So I think if that's something that we want to pursue, it should be a very high bar, I'm not sure we can pull it off. The table on the back that you're referring to, that's 2025, that's what's happened so far this year. And so as we look ahead to 2026, we would be planning to bring the Habitat Committee in-person twice. And we planned to do that this year too but what we prioritize are

the committees that are there where Council interaction with those committees are necessary based on the agenda topics and so we had to, I can't remember which meeting we did this, but we had to squeeze off the Habitat Committee for some others based on your agenda and the committees that you needed to interact with. So we would intend to keep moving forward in 2026 with two in-person Habitat Committee events.

Sharon Kiefer [00:05:31] That's helpful. When I looked at the table I just assumed it would be a rollover for 26' so that's helpful clarity.

Pete Hassemer [00:05:39] Lynn Mattes.

Lynn Mattes [00:05:41] Thank you Chair. Thanks for letting me pop in just before I have to jet away. On the Year-At-A-Glance, I believe it's March, has risk....thank you, Initiative 4 wrap-up crossed out under the ecosystem agenda item and then I don't see it anywhere else on the agenda on the Year-At-A-Glance, is that no longer an issue? Are we putting it off TBD? I was just.....it was requested that I ask for some follow up about what the plan is for Initiative 4? Thank you. And Mr. Ainsworth is going be in the ODFW seat virtually for now.

Merrick Burden [00:06:20] Yeah, appreciate the question Miss Mattes. I did anticipate that question. The Initiative 4 Wrap-Up Agenda Item had several lines of thinking behind it. One was we wanted a deliberate agenda item where we could report back as part of our grant reporting duties and say we have wrapped this up. I actually think that happened here. And so we had reports from the Science Center, lots of discussion this week that said we've run this parallel process. This is what the risk tables look like on the groundfish side, and so we've done it. The question now is how do we implement it? And that then has caused us to move to the risk management framework that's under groundfish now in April. So that as we move forward how do we start to implement these things and who does what to implement them?

Lynn Mattes [00:07:15] Thank you. I really appreciate the clarification on what we've done and how the plan is to move forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:07:25] Corey Ridings, then Vice-Chair Smith.

Corey Ridings [00:07:29] Thanks Chair. I was going build off what you just mentioned in terms of the Initiative 4 wrap-up. That makes sense in terms of not having it on the agenda. I'm wondering if we can ask the EWG to do some sort of short document for us that kind of provides maybe a written wrap-up? I'm not even thinking of anything longer than a page necessarily. It would be at their discretion, but maybe some sort way that we can have that for our record and our webpage to talk about sort of where those items went and sort of put a bow on it. Would that make sense in your mind? I haven't tracked this, it sounds like quite as carefully as you have across the threads. So just putting that out as a suggestion in lieu of having a full agenda item.

Merrick Burden [00:08:21] Yeah, I think that's a good and reasonable suggestion is to have some reflection on that and my initial response would be to have that as perhaps an informational report either in November or March, probably March at this point. If that would suffice for you I think we can talk with the EWG about something like that.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:45] That good?

Corey Ridings [00:08:46] That sounds good to me. I would simply just give the EWG leverage. I'm sure they'll tell us if they want or need more so that sounds great.

Pete Hassemer [00:08:57] Vice-Chair Smith.

Butch Smith [00:08:59] Yeah thanks to you Mr. Chair. I just want address something Sharon said because we lived through this one time and it was a mess. God bless the Habitat Committee and where we can get them here, you know, where, that's great. But we did the two motel thing in Rohnert Park and it was an absolute mess. People felt, you know, what one leg in the process and one leg out of the process and it just, you now, that would be an absolute, in my opinion, last, last, last, last resort before doing that again because it just, like I said it, best way to describe it, it was a mess. So I just thought I'd, being one that lived through that, I don't know how many people were in the process that had the two motel thing, but it was no good. So thank you Mr. Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:10:02] All right, anyone else? Corey Ridings.

Corey Ridings [00:10:06] Thanks Chair. Thanks Vice. I'm not, I'm going to disagree with you just for fun because it wouldn't be a meeting if I didn't get a chance to do that. Just noting on that I think that, I appreciate your thoughts there. I'm sure it was difficult for some people. I also think in general, as we try to be more efficient, while we try be inclusive, while we tried to bring people together, we heard a lot of statements that a lot groups just want to be in-person and I think we've been hearing that for a long time. I think that our advisors are adults and I think it's acceptable to be able to anticipate that they can get themselves from a nearby hotel to the Council hotel. And I think if the difference is that they're not going to be able come I'd rather that, and I trust Council staff to figure out these logistics in the best way possible, but I'd rather hold options open for now and into the future about being able to stay at multiple hotels and giving us that flexibility to do that moving forward.

Pete Hassemer [00:11:16] Thank you. Any other thoughts, discussion here on the agenda? And if I don't see any hands.....Corey Ridings and then Aja.

Corey Ridings [00:11:35] Thanks Chair. I wanted to bring up the risk table item. I appreciate what Council staff did. Thank you Director Burden for giving us an overview at the beginning of this agenda item in terms of taking out the two risk table items, one's under groundfish, one's under salmon, and moving them into this larger risk management framework. And I took notes and it sounds like they're being slightly different, conceptualized slightly differently for salmon and for groundfish. I might counter that I think, or at least it's my opinion, thinking about the groundfish risk tables in particular. You know we had a pilot of them as part of our stock assessment process this year. We received positive feedback from the SSC as well as the public in terms of their value. They have sort of, they've been going for a while and so I think it might be helpful if we, you know, whether or not they stay agendized where they are at this moment in time, to keep the risk table separate at least for groundfish, and that way so that piece can sort of wrap-up. I think the GMT and the GAP and the SSC can continue to weigh-in on that. The Science Center can have conversations about whether this is implementable again in two more years when we have our next stock assessments. But just because this piece feels discreet and like it's already been piloted and it's already kind of out of the station, but we wrap that up and finish that on some timeline in the next year. And then also move forward with the larger risk management framework. I agree with you in the way you described it, that I've been hearing a lot of things, even at this meeting in particular, about how we think about risk and how that fits in and how we can do a better job of not only including that in our management, but how we talk about it and how we understand it and how implement it as a Council. So I'm supportive of that and just again making the suggestion that we keep the risk table piece separate for groundfish for now.

Merrick Burden [00:13:50] I appreciate those remarks Miss Ridings. I believe our heads are in the same place and what I don't want to do is back up and have a sky-visioning exercise that then slows everything down. I think there are discrete pieces in this risk management approach, and so whether

that looks like two back-to-back agenda items that are labeled differently or one that has discrete pieces, I'm not sure, but The intent here is not to slow down one while we wait for a bigger picture. It's that there are discrete pieces in that conversation. And so I'll take your comment to heart and maybe that means we end up calling it two different back-to-back agenda items, I'm not sure, but I agree with you there is a discrete piece here that's further along than some of the others perhaps.

Pete Hassemer [00:14:44] Thank you. Aja Szumylo.

Aja Szumylo [00:14:46] Thank you Chair. I just wanted to note, I'm confirming this, but I just wanted to note the lack of a public or of an advisory body report from the GAP, and I think this meeting was hard for them and the GMT as well. It was a really meaty meeting and really challenging to get the number of things that they had to do done remotely together, and so I just wanted to make sure that that was captured in the broader discussion. I don't think that that sentiment really came up. But in the context of making sure that people can be together, I just want to flag weighing the complexity of the things that the group has to wrestle with at that meeting with their attendance. And so yeah, in terms of balancing across a larger group, yeah I agree, I think people are adults. If we can bring togetherness and the hotel is limiting then maybe there are other ways to accomplish that, but then also for us to just look at what they have to do and really try to have them together when it's a really big week. And that's all.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:00] Thank you Aja. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:16:08] Thank you Chair. If there's other comments here I don't want to stop discussion. I had something on a completely different part of the agenda.

Pete Hassemer [00:16:15] So, no, maybe I can just, in response to Miss Szumylo's comments, this was a difficult meeting to plan for. I think if you remember, I mean we had contemplated an Executive Committee meeting and contracts and what was going to happen, and just from on the leadership team, and Mr. Pettinger was in there at that time too in early August, we didn't get word till sometime late August that we had, meaning so I hear everything you say and it'd be great to have them. This was a tough one and there were very different circumstances. So thank you. With that, Ryan, go ahead.

Ryan Wulff [00:17:02] Yeah, thanks. And this is more of a question. I know some other folks probably were more engaged than, it helped being in-person. But I wanted to come back to something that happened during the salmon agenda item at this meeting. I think we had a kind of a roadmap that was put forward in one of the documents that was discussed that if we were going to go kind of down an FMP amendment approach for Sacramento fall Chinook, the first substantive milestone would be in November, but I don't see anything here as it relates to that or just wondering, I don't know if there's a question for Merrick or maybe just for others around the table there, if there's been any consideration of should we add something? Would that fall under an existing agenda type? Will we need to make a modification here if we were planning to try and meet that first step of the kind of milestones in the informational report that was discussed. Maybe I'll leave it there and see if there's any guidance from either Council staff or if any other comments from other folks.

Pete Hassemer [00:18:06] All right, before Executive Director Burden responds, John North we see your hand, we'll get to you. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:18:17] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman, and thanks for the question Ryan. So Ryan, your question relates to a question that I posed about what to do in November for what's currently scheduled as agenda item G.4. And before the Council took action earlier this week that decided this Sac fall issue was going to be done through an FMP amendment, this was heading down the road of a

methodology review. And so I'm trying to reimagine what G.4 is. Right now it's a Sac Fall Work Group progress report. My current thinking now is that this is more of a planning item and a discussion to take a step back and say, okay, we are proceeding down the road of an FMP amendment. What does that look like? Who do we need? What sort of skills do we need to take that on? And just chatting here a bit with Angela, I think she's prepared to offer up some materials that would help you have that conversation. That's where my head is now, and I guess that's a proposal for you all to chew on and see if that resonates with you or whether you'd like that agenda item to be something different.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:38] Anyone want to respond to that or just think about it for now?

John North [00:19:44] Mr. Chair.

Pete Hassemer [00:19:45] Go ahead John.

John North [00:19:48] Yeah, John North, Oregon Fish and Wildlife, remote. Yeah, and I guess in regards to salmon in November I agree. I think what would be most beneficial is if Executive Director Burden and staff could further scope out the path forward for a Sacramento fall Chinook FMP amendment. Maybe refine what the product, the timeline would be, what the role of the current work group would be, or do we need a revised development team specific to the FMP? I don't know, but further detail on that I think would help us. You know with that product we could be more informed and make better decisions moving forward. Probably should have a, ideally a specific agenda item in November, maybe an hour or so to further discuss the path going forward based on what we've done here at this meeting. As far as what we might want to see from the work group itself in November, I don't really have any specific guidance right now. But if they have anything that would inform or add value related to the FMP amendment process, I think that'd be worth sharing. And just on a side note, I still remain interested in that cohort reconstruction or development of a spawner recruit function. And I think, you know, that was the stuff discussed in Chen et al 2024. I think at that time we didn't have enough years of data to develop a valid relationship, but I was wondering as we go forward with this FMP process, you know would that provide enough time where that approach might be able to be folded in or at least reevaluated as the amendment process proceeds? So I guess those are just a few thoughts, but I think you're headed in the right direction. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:08] Thanks. Other thoughts? Discussion? Let me check the hands here. John, I don't know if you had something else to follow-up and Briana Brady. Let's go to Briana first.

Briana Brady [00:22:25] Thanks Mr. Chair. I would just agree with that last sentiment of what John North said about thinking that Merrick is on the right path. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:22:36] All right, thank you. Hand just popped up again. I'm sorry, this ring central platform doesn't make it easy to find who it is. Ryan Wulff.

Ryan Wulff [00:22:50] Yeah, just quickly, since I asked the question. Thanks Merrick. That's helpful. I support how you kind of outlined it, so that's helpful. Thank you.

Pete Hassemer [00:23:00] All right, thanks. Anyone else? Brad Pettinger.

Brad Pettinger [00:23:06] Yeah, thank you Chair Hassemer. I've been involved in a lot of these meetings my eight plus years in the Council and the future Council Meeting Agenda and Workload Planning was always long and arduous and just hats off to our Executive Director and Deputy Director for....I mean, this is a fantastic job in making this as painless as possible. And even right towards the end, I mean you're adjusting things and just....I don't think much has changed on here, right? I mean,

that's unheard of prior. And not that those folks didn't do a great job, but I mean just take the extra level. If we would have been five years ago and been starting this topic, we'd be in trouble because we wouldn't be out of here by five. So anyway just hats off to you and Kelly for just, I mean you're doing a fantastic job and I just....just well done.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:07] All right, thanks. And just don't get the idea that June's really light to make it easy for your last meeting there. Vice-Chair Smith did you have something?

Butch Smith [00:24:16] Just added to Brad. It was like a root canal without Novocain is what it was like. So at least we got Novocain now, but yeah it was painful.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:30] All right, if there's no other questions. Well, Christa has one, but just a quick remark, Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:24:38] I appreciate that. And Brad you're looking at me but Kelly deserves almost all the thanks for getting us here so.

Pete Hassemer [00:24:45] Thanks. Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:24:47] Yeah, thank you. And I agree with the sentiments. Having to not have to fight things out forever is very appreciative. Wanted to lend a little support to Corey's path put forward earlier today and appreciative around the Initiative 4 wrap-up, particularly, because I had it pointed out to me that we had asked in a motion to have the EWG provide a report. I feel comfortable that that could be informational rather than having a full-fledged agenda item, but just nice to have a nice bow wrapped on that. I do want to just raise for topic of discussion, and I know it's getting late, but I did have the MPC folks reach out to me. And I hadn't realized it, that we had a additional informational report on California aquaculture. And I know that they are in the process of planning an MPC meeting, and I'm just wondering if it would be worthwhile to have a conversation about that through the Council process in November. And I see a little bit of head nodding, but interested in hearing other people's opinions around this on the floor and wanted to at least open it for discussion for a few minutes this afternoon rather than not taking an hour if there is one available potentially for those folks.

Pete Hassemer [00:26:12] Thank you. Jaime Diamond.

Jaime Diamond [00:26:14] Thank you. Through the Chair, Miss Svensson, I was going to raise the same issue that the beauty of the MPC is most of those folks are already going to be there, it looks like, or at least a fair amount of those folks will already be at the meeting. I'm not sure exactly who else. I believe it's a representative from each of the advisory bodies, a representative or two. But I did flag that informational report at the beginning of the meeting with Miss Quan, and just flagging the concern over that for folks in Southern California especially. So it would....it would also make sense in November since that meeting is in Southern California and stakeholders would be able to provide any input relatively easily if there's a way for the MPC to at least have some time to meet and talk and go over that and folks to comment. Thanks.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:17] Thank you. Executive Director Burden.

Merrick Burden [00:27:22] Let's see, just in response to that, our schedule right now has really like one spare hour, so if we could keep that refined and tight to the Aquaculture Opportunity Areas, I think that's possible. We still do have just the question of space, so we can look into that. It might be doable.

Pete Hassemer [00:27:50] Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:27:51] Yeah, thank you Mr. Chair. The conversation that I had with certainly not all of the MPC, but some of the people on it was that they thought that they could keep it to an hour. So certainly not asking for everybody to weigh-in with a bajillion reports, but I do think just in reading the notification on guidance from the Council, it might be worthwhile for all of us to take the time and the hour to really help set the course on this for my colleagues in Southern California in particular. Certainly not to speak for you.

Jaime Diamond [00:28:28] Thank you especially. I would just point out that a lot of these areas do interact with HMS and groundfish in particular and so, yeah. Yeah, I know there's other things that are looking for time as well so not sure how to balance that.

Pete Hassemer [00:28:50] All right. Executive Director Burden unless I see another hand here there'll be more time, but why don't you just summarize or tell us where we are.

Merrick Burden [00:29:04] Yeah, I think we've had a good discussion. So I made note of a few things. Let's see, moving from the left, we did start talking about the Legislative Committee and pulling that off. I'm not sure if we'll even need it, but I've made note of maybe rescheduling the time if possible, although that starts to overlap with the Budget Committee and other things or looking for a different sort of time if possible if we need it. Let's see moving through the November schedule. Let's see the Sac fall agenda item, we will make that a planning agenda item, so planning for the FMP amendment. What's on my mind there are thoughts about who works on that. We have some, one mighty salmon staff officer, but I suspect the FMP amendment will require a bit more help. I made note of a MPC Aquaculture Opportunity Area focused meeting that would involve bringing MPC folks in-person. Those are the notes I've made for November. And then as I look across the rest of the year, there is this EWG Report on risk tables I've make note of, aiming for that to be a informational report at the moment in March, although I heard that we have latitudes, so we'll talk with EWG about that and come to some resolution about the best way forward. One question that I flagged early on was whether there was a preference for in-person HMS meetings in either March or June? I don't know if you want to weigh into that now, but I did hear an exchange in particular from you Miss Svensson about that topic, so just curious if there's more on that?

Pete Hassemer [00:30:53] Christa.

Christa Svensson [00:30:59] Yeah, thank you. You know, in reading that report it was very clear that they prefer to meet in-person, particularly for topics that are difficult and or potentially time-consuming, I guess I would say, because not everything is difficult. You know, I think we heard Aja speak today about the difficulty for the GAP in this meeting by meeting remotely specific to that item. I mean if we needed to move it to June potentially, if there can be only one in-person meeting then maybe that is the approach to take. I don't know that I'm ready to say let's move it from where it is in March. It might be worthwhile to just have that conversation in November dependent upon really what our resources look like financially for next year if we can afford to bring everybody to all of the meetings. I am going to just note real quickly that because I think that there's going to be an MPC meeting in October online, it might be worthwhile checking with the co-chairs about whether they think they need to meet in-person at the November meeting. The request that I got was could we possibly get an hour on the agenda, not specific that we needed to bring people to the meeting if we're trying to economize in terms of how to get people into a very small hotel in November. So just putting that out there as a potential way to try and make sure everybody gets what they need as efficiently as possible.

Merrick Burden [00:32:54] Okay, I appreciate that feedback Miss Svensson. I was just pausing to see if there was any other remarks, but I think we can leave that question as it is and come back to it in November. Let's see, I'll just look to Kelly and see if she had any other questions or any other remarks?

Things hanging out there that we might want to raise with the Council?

Kelly Ames [00:33:17] Thank you Executive Director Burden. I think I have enough guidance to update the documents and you'll see them all in the November briefing book.

Pete Hassemer [00:33:30] All right, with that I believe there is nothing else to do on this agenda item. We'll close it out. I thank you all for a very productive, I know at times difficult, complex topics here and things, but good work by all.