

BS FEP Team Response to Ecosystem Committee Minutes from February 6, 2018 on the BS FEP

Committee comment	Response in July 2018 Draft FEP
1. Crosswalk the connection in Chapter 2 between the FEP objectives and how they are addressed in the core FEP and proposed action modules;	Chapter 2 has been revised to make these connections more clear. Objectives that link specifically to Action Modules have been placed in a separate Research Objectives section.
2. Clearly identify references in the FEP to distinguish discussion of Federal versus State fisheries and include a description of the relationship of Federal and State partners in fishery management;	Clarifications throughout, and additional discussion of Federal vs State fisheries added specifically to Chapter 4, in the regulatory jurisdiction (4.1.1) and commercial fisheries (4.3.2) subsections, and some additional description of Federal-State partnership has been added to the Council Process section in Section 5.1.
3. Consider rewording the ecosystem objectives section to include a more generic description of “tools in the ecosystem toolbox”, with further work to come on identifying measurable objectives related to the ecosystem goals;	The Team has reconsidered how to frame the discussion of Ecosystem Objectives since the February draft, as described in Chapter 2. The intent of the Ecosystem Objectives is to monitor the status of the ecosystem consistent with progress towards achieving the Ecosystem Goals identified in the document. Monitoring will occur through the annual Ecosystem Status Report (presented with the SAFE reports).
4. Clarify that development of appropriate Council responses to changing conditions should occur within the existing Council process (with plan team, SSC, Council review), consistent with the FEP’s intent to be action informing rather than action forcing. Include a diagram or flow chart with examples;	This has been clarified in Section 3.2, describing how Action Modules work. The Team is working on a diagram.
5. Consider how the FEP should address issues that are generally not within the Council’s jurisdiction, such as water quality. Potentially consider developing an action module to evaluate available monitoring and how such information would or would not be actionable by the Council;	Clarifications have been included throughout to highlight what actions are within the Council’s jurisdiction, and which are not. This distinction is an important one in considering some of the existing Action Modules, and with respect to the water quality example offered, is a good discussion item for the Ecosystem Committee at the July meeting.
6. Distinguish between the description of subsistence activity and the cultural understanding in BS communities of a subsistence lifestyle;	Section 4.3.3 has been substantially updated to address this comment.

Committee comment

7. Describe how the FEP relates to programmatic groundfish policy objectives for groundfish, especially with respect to assessment of the Council's existing management approach;
8. Consider a periodic retrospective analysis of management that looks at what did and did not work, and actions may warrant further investment;
9. Ensure that the Alaska regional EBFM implementation plan (under development) and the FEP are consistent, and specifically include a need to incorporate LTK into the ecosystem assessment process;
10. Revise the subsistence action module to include a first priority to improve the Council's methods for addressing LTK in the short- to long-term, and develop a methodology to improve information on subsistence activity in management analyses;
11. Augment the LTK discussion in the core FEP to consider the three areas previously referenced by the Ecosystem Committee: a basic understanding of LTK principles as part of EBFM, consistent inclusion of LTK in the description of the BS ecosystem, and the action module discussion;
12. Consider including the example of using LTK as an early warning system for ecosystem change in partnership with western science (e.g., sea lions on St Lawrence Island) as an illustration of LTK as a citizen science role;
13. Add a clear description of the function and intent of action modules as compared to the core FEP;
14. Rename the research tracking action module to reflect a broader intent to better align Council research priorities with other research funding opportunities and ensure that the module does not focus exclusively on the NPRB but includes other funding bodies.

Response in July 2018 Draft FEP

Chapter 5, which assesses EBFM in the current management approach, discusses the groundfish management policy in Section 5.4. The groundfish policy objectives have also been used to inform the development of Ecosystem Objectives in Chapter 2.

This has been added as a Process Objective in Chapter 2.

The Alaska Regional Implementation Plan (which is now out as a draft for review) is consistent with the FEP, is described in Section 3.6.1, and explicit mention of LTK has been included.

The Action Module has been revised accordingly. See summary in 7.4 and study plan in Appendix B.3.

LK and TK have been explicitly added into the document in Section 1.2 (as part of EBFM principles), in the Human Network component of the description of the BS ecosystem (Section 4.3.4), in the Action Module (see answer above), and in the public involvement plan discussion (Chapter 8). At the upcoming meeting, the Team will discuss a new graphical template for synthesizing the biological ecosystem (to go in Section 4.2), and will consider how LK and TK should be included as part of that development.

This recommendation was added to the bulleted list of Council considerations for action in the LTK/ Subsistence Action Module description (see Appendix B.3).

This description is included in Chapter 3, sections 3.1 and 3.2. The FEP team is working on a diagram.

The Action Module has been updated accordingly (see Section 7.5 and Appendix B.4).