

# TAB E

## Sustainable Fisheries/Ecosystem Management Committee Report June 8, 2015 Leann Bosarge - V. Chair

### National Standard 1, 3, and 7 Proposed Revisions

Council staff reviewed the proposed recommendations contained in the draft letter to NMFS. The following comments for modification of the recommendations were made by individuals.

Recommendation 1 (reassess the objectives of the fishery on a regular basis) – Committee members suggested that the time period for reviewing objectives should be more specific. A suggestion was made to reassess the objectives of the fishery on a regular basis, **not to exceed five (or some other number) years.**

Recommendation 11 (The rebuilding time period shall not exceed 10 years, except where biology of the stock, other environmental conditions...) – Committee members suggested that the inclusion of the social and economic environments be explicitly included by changing the wording to, “The time period shall not exceed 10 years, except where biology of the stock, **impacts to the socio-economic environment or other** environmental conditions, or management measures under an international agreement to which the U.S. participates, dictate otherwise..”

Recommendation 14 (Emergency Actions and Interim Measures) – The committee had no opposition to staff’s proposal to recommend adding the 1997 criteria for emergency action to the section. Mara Levy stated that the section only included criteria for interim rules because National Standard 1 pertains only to preventing overfishing and achieving optimum yield.

Other comments made (but not recommending changes to the letter) included:

Recommendation 2 (Stocks that require conservation and management) – Mara Levy stated that the proposed revisions eliminate the criteria for determining ecosystem component species, and replace them with more general language for determining species that are in need of management. Species that do not meet that guidance could be declared ecosystem component stocks.

Recommendation 8 (ABC phase-in) – Mara Levy stated that the proposal to allow ending of overfishing to be phased in over a period not to exceed three years is inconsistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act requirement to end overfishing immediately.

Recommendation 13 (Adequate Progress) – Mara Levy stated that the reason why the NS1 proposed revisions called for a review every two years is because the Magnuson-Stevens Act specifies that for any overfished fishery the Secretary review any fishery management plan, plan amendment, or regulations at routine intervals that may not exceed two years

**The Committee recommends, and I so move to give staff editorial license in amending the document found as Tab B4a.**

Motion carried without opposition

**Review of Draft CCC NEPA White Paper**

Council staff reviewed the intent of the proposal to integrate NEPA requirements into the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The CCC proposal contains the same language that is in H.R. 1335. There is some opposition due to concern that this would weaken the Council requirements relative to current NEPA requirements. The proposal is intended to maintain the requirements but incorporate them into the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The Committee had no opposition to incorporating the proposed changes into the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Staff will present the Council's recommendations at the CCC meeting.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report.