

UNOFFICIAL PARTIAL TRANSCRIPTS FROM THE APRIL 2013 COUNCIL MEETING,
INCLUDING BOTH AGENDA ITEMS
D.7.f (TRAWL RATIONALIZATION TRAILING ACTIONS – ELECTRONIC
MONITORING REGULATORY PROCESS) AND
B.7.d (FUTURE MEETING AGENDA AND WORKLOAD PLANNING)

1
2 Selected segments of the audio record of Council discussion related to the whitepaper on
3 performance standards and calendar.

4
5 From sound files:

6 ftp://ftp.pccouncil.org/pub/R1304_April_2013_Recordings/4-9-13pm3Copy.mp3

7 ftp://ftp.pccouncil.org/pub/R1304_April_2013_Recordings/4-10-13am1Copy.mp3

8 ftp://ftp.pccouncil.org/pub/R1304_April_2013_Recordings/4-11-13pm1Copy.mp3
9

10 **APRIL 9, 2013 – AGENDA ITEM D.7.f**

11
12 **Motion 19:** I move that the Council

13 1. Confirm that the primary focus of integration of EM into trawl catch
14 share monitoring is to address compliance monitoring needs

15
16 2. Adopt the regulatory objectives contained in the Agenda Item D.7.b
17 EM Workshop report as modified by the recommendations in the Agenda
18 Item D7.d Supplemental GAP report.

19
20 3. Direct the Council staff to work with federal and state agencies to
21 develop a white paper that would identify monitoring performance standards
22 and other requirements that EM proposals would have to meet.

23
24 4. Develop a initial scoping package that would include, the strawman
25 proposals contained in the EM Workshop reports as initial EM alternatives
26 (splitting pot and longline as recommended in the Supplemental GAP Report),
27 as well as an option of electronic monitoring participation agreements, the
28 information resulting from the information requests in the report as available
29 and an initial list of the issues and tradeoffs that will need to be addressed
30

31 Moved by: Dorothy Lowman Seconded by: Gway Kirchner
32

33 **4-9-13pm3Copy.mp3**

34 **{Start Time: 0:03:27}**
35

36 Wolford: Discussion

37 Lowman: I think we've had a lot of discussion about what's the primary focus and that we're
38 not looking to, we recognize that our monitoring program needs to be a combination of observers
39 as necessary to meet our science needs for stock assessments and other science needs as well as
40 trying to provide for some alternative tools, as possible to meet some of the compliance
41 monitoring needs. I also think that we made a good start, I think that I like our regulatory

1 objectives that came out of the workshop, as modified by the GAP. I would expect that perhaps
2 these would be refined or added to through a scoping process, but this is a good start. I do think,
3 and I agree with Michele in that we've got some work to do to understand what are our
4 standards, what are our monitoring requirements that any proposal would have to address. I
5 would like to get us down the road on that by having Council staff work with the Federal and
6 state agencies to develop a whitepaper that would identify monitoring performance standards and
7 other requirements that would come back to the Council that the Council would look at add to
8 work on refining.

9
10 Finally, I think we need to get started and I would like to see an initial scoping package
11 developed that would include the strawmen that are contained in the workshop reports. I think
12 pot and longline are different enough that it would be helpful split them into two. We had some
13 discussions about some different ways to have some participation agreements. But I also think
14 the step in #3 will also provide an opportunity for some other creative ways that might come up
15 that will come out of the scoping process. Finally, there was a list of information requests, some
16 of which we got some information from the center today, I'm not sure we'll have them fully
17 completed before we start scoping but we will have a beginning, I would like whatever
18 information is available to be part of that scoping package as well as I think we do need to start
19 to outline, because there are a little issues and tradeoffs that need to be considered, so I think
20 they should be included an initial list of some of the issues and tradeoffs that will need to be
21 addressed. We don't have to answer all of them but I think we should identify them up front.

22
23 Culver: Just a question, first on the motion. On item number 4. Who did you see developing the
24 initial scoping package? Is that the Council staff with the Federal and state agencies or is that
25 just through the normal Council process and the entire Council?

26
27 Lowman: I'm thinking of a scoping package as the first start and that then leads a discussion
28 through the whole normal process and gets refined but it's kind of a paper that helps us start our
29 scoping process. So, I would see Council staff putting it together with assistance as needed from
30 state and Federal agencies. In other words, something that would be sent out for people to
31 consider as providing scoping comments etc. And then would be the start of the scoping process.

32
33 Culver: With that, I would like to offer an amendment that would "delay the development of the
34 initial scoping package until item #3 was completed. As part of that scoping package the
35 strawman proposals could be considered but there might be things that come out of the
36 whitepaper that we might want to have as a different starting point, rather than those proposals."
37 Lincoln seconded.

38
39 **Amndmnt 1:** For item #4, delay the development of the scoping package until item #3 is
40 completed. The strawman proposals could be considered (things that come out of
41 the whitepaper) that we might want as a starting point rather than those proposals.

42
43 Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Rich Lincoln

44
45 Wolford: Discussion?

46
47 Lockhart: You're not saying that activity on scoping couldn't continue, it's just that it should be
48 informed by #3 and then not completed until #3 is done.

1
2 Culver: Yes and while we still might want the straw proposals we might want to tweak those a
3 little bit or have different proposals depending on what we come up with for the whitepaper in
4 #3. So #3 would inform the proposals that are considered in the scoping.

5
6 Lowman: Maybe it's a semantics of process but to me I saw these as a package still and you'd
7 have these as a startup point, then we'd have additional proposals coming through the Council
8 meeting that we had the beginning of scoping. Those would again be incorporated into the next
9 package that went on to be fleshed out further by whatever group is working on it. To me, and
10 maybe it was part of what Frank was saying, I don't see waiting to put together packages, I saw
11 them as two parts of a package that would inform the first meeting that we started to focus to
12 flesh out our package. At that time, additional people might bring additional proposals that
13 would come because of what the performance standards were. They would go into the next
14 iteration.

15
16 Hanson: I'm not sure what the "until item 3 is completed" means. Does it mean it's been totally
17 vetted by the Council or they've finished with the thing and its ready to come to the Council in
18 June but then they can start working on it on the next phase or, what are thinking for schedule?

19
20 Culver: I'd like an opportunity to speak to my amendment. I'm trying to address these questions
21 so maybe this would help. I saw item #4 in line with the comments that I made earlier of the cart
22 before the horse, and thinking that the Council should develop our performance standards and
23 clearly communicate those, the side boards if you will, before we move forward with having
24 proposals go out there for further scoping or to get further public input. The intent that I
25 considered whether to just simply strike item #4 but I didn't want to give the impression that I
26 disagreed with developing a scoping package. It's just the timing of when that package would be
27 developed. And so rather than strike #4 I am saying that this group of Council staff and agency
28 staff would develop a whitepaper that would come before the Council. There would be some
29 Council discussion and agreement on what those performance standards would be and then
30 potentially a review of those straw proposals to see whether or not the meet those performance
31 standards, and if not, how they may need to be changed and then have those proposals go out in
32 an initial scoping package. And so it's trying to have Council guidance on the sideboards
33 developed first before industry spends time reacting to the straw proposals or developing new
34 proposals only to have us say no those are not the rocks we had in mind.

35
36 McIsaac: A question following up on Dr. Hanson's, looking at the schedule that is in the
37 workshop report, it shows a full scoping session for the June 2013 Council meeting. In the
38 amendment then you are calling for the item #3 to be discussed at the June Council meeting and
39 delay the scoping session until after June?

40
41 Culver: I'm definitely saying delay the scoping until after June. I'm not speaking to whether or
42 not the whitepaper is completed for June.

43
44 **[Amendment 1 to Motion 19 passed unanimously.]**

45
46 Lockhart. Question on #1, and this gets at performance standards and what this actually means
47 in light of #1. Compliance monitoring needs, I think that is different from science needs but it's
48 also a pretty broad definition of what could potentially be looked at. Is that compliance-is the

Council discussion of Motion 20 and its amendments are not included here.

Motion 20: I move that the Council

1. Forward the recommendations from the EM Workshop found on page vi of the Workshop report.
2. Request NMFS and PSMFC work together to determine what should be included in “total catch” for catch accounting purposes and provide this information to the Council as well to assure that consistent definitions are used during the 2013 study.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

Amendment 1: change #2 striking the original language and replace with “*PSMFC conform to the NFMS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting purposes in this study.*”

Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Joanna Grebel
Amendment 1 was not voted on

Amendment 2: as a substitute to Amendment 1: for part two: “*Request PSMFC conforms to NFMS definition of “total catch” for catch accounting for purposes of this study to the maximum extent practicable*”

Moved By: Dave Hanson Seconded by: Herb Pollard
Amendment 2 carried (Culver, Myer and Lincoln voted no)

Motion 20 carried unanimously

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Motion 21: Council

1. Move forward the process and schedule shown on page vii of the Workshop report recognizing that attainment of the schedule will be dependent on budget and workload considerations with the following changes have the performance standards WP at the June 13 meeting; move full scoping to Sept 13.
2. Request that NMFS NW Region evaluate the implications on staff workload and ability to address other important trailing action needs should an out of cycle “EFP” avenue be explored to begin to allow testing EM usage without an observer prior to completion of the full regulatory package.
3. Explore the relative budget implications and other costs/benefits relative to having a workgroup be appointed with the characteristics described in recommendations of the GAP and the EC, or to have a subgroup of the GAP be tasked with the responsibilities that would be assigned to the workgroup.

Moved by: Dorothy Lowman Seconded by: Gway Kirchner

{Start Time: 0:41:15}

Wolford, Do you want to speak to this please?

1 Lowman: Yes In terms of the first one, I have heard loud and clear the concerns of everyone
2 about the fact that we need to move forward as rapidly as possible. I do also think that the
3 performance standards are really an important step. And of course that was recognized in our
4 first motion but I think we want to keep going as fast as possible. It is an ambitious schedule.
5 And again we may find the budget and workloads, like many schedules they sometimes slip
6 some. But I think we should try to do this because it is very important. \

7 **{Stop Time: 0:41:51}**

8

9 **{Start Time: 0:44:39}**

10 Grebel:Relative to number 1 and having the whitepaper come back at the June meeting, I
11 thought that we've heard that there is quite a very large meeting in May in DC, so I'm just
12 curious as to the ability for that product to actually be produced and have state and Federal staff
13 input on time to meet the deadlines for that June meeting.

14

15 McIsaac: Well let me speak to several references to workload and financial considerations that
16 are involved here. This is a major major effort. I think someone here said earlier that this is
17 about a big as Amendment 20 or it's in that zone. {Stop Time: 45:24} ... [extended description
18 of workload and financial considerations]... {Start Time: 48:24} So with regard to the narrow
19 piece of time during the month of May and whether a whitepaper could be done as described
20 earlier, I don't know. I guess I'd like a little time to huddle with Jim and come back under B.7 as
21 to exactly how much time that would take and huddle with NMFS about what kind of quickness
22 that might be involved during the middle of April so that someone could be provided to help,
23 rather immediately.

24

25 Crabbe: So just the way I'm reading this motion all of the flexibility that you are asking for is
26 available it's just sort of sending the message that we would like to move as quickly as possible
27 but if it's not possible we have the flexibility to adjust.

28

29 McIsaac: I think the answer to that is generally yes. I think the first thing that people have been
30 looking for is: does the Council want to move forward with electronic monitoring or not? The
31 previous motions demonstrated that as yes. As we fine tune this we'll do our best to try to carry
32 out what you'd like to do and let you know under B.7 more exactly about what can be done,
33 particularly in the near term.

34

35 Culver: I do think that looking at electronic monitoring, we should further discuss that as a
36 Council and with the industry and move forward with doing that. I do think we accomplished
37 that with the first motion. I do think developing the performance standards is going to take a
38 little bit more time than what would be available to us between now and the June Council
39 meeting. I think the briefing book deadline was in early June. And we do have quite a bit going
40 on already in the month of May. I'm also not quite sure what the process is to approve those
41 performance standards, so I didn't necessarily think that that was a one Council meeting process.
42 And whether those performance standards would be incorporated into a Council operating
43 procedure or how we would somehow formalize those performance standards for electronic
44 monitoring. I kind of thought the Council would have a chance to look at them as draft, maybe
45 get some comment from the advisory bodies and the public before finalizing those. So I looked
46 it as a two meeting process. And so, I'm suggesting perhaps that be September and November.
47 Once we have those performance standards defined and have back and forth with some industry
48 and stake holders it would be good to hear from them whether they still support EM as one of

1 their highest priorities, now that they know what performance standards have to be met and how
2 much it might cost and whether they will be able to see the benefits of cost reduction that their
3 anticipating. So it would be good to get that feedback as well before we say yes for sure we
4 want to go forward with scoping and developing alternatives and following the rest of the
5 process outlined here. But having said that I do think that we have heard that this is important to
6 industry and I do think that at this point we should give them our best guess as to how quickly it
7 could happened and to outline a schedule that if everything fell into place here is the timing of
8 that, from a reasonable standpoint and so I guess I would see the September November schedule
9 being the whitepaper on the performance standards moving the scoping session on EM to begin
10 either in June or September of 2014.

11 **{Stop Time: 0:53:14}**

12
13 **Amendment 1:** under part 1 strike out “*have the performance standards WP at the June*
14 *13 meeting; move full scoping to Sept 13*”. And replace with “*whitepaper on*
15 *performance standards considered in draft at the Sept 13 meeting; finalized at*
16 *Nov 13 meeting. Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014; this would push the*
17 *other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to Nov 2015.*”

18
19 Moved By: Michele Culver Seconded by: Frank Lockhart

20
21 *[Administrative discussion related to stating the motion and getting it properly phrased*
22 *on the screen]*

23
24 **{Start Time: 0:56:07}**

25 Wolford: Michele

26 Culver: So working from the language that’s captured in number one, it would be move forward
27 the process and schedule shown on page 7 of the workshop report recognizing that attainment of
28 the schedule will be dependent on the budget and workload considerations with the following
29 changes. And then strike have the performance standards and replace it with what’s in yellow
30 and the rest of the motion would stand

31 Wolford: OK. So I think that’s fairly clear.

32 *[the motion was seconded]*

33 Wolford: Further discussion.

34 Culver: Yes, if I may.

35 Again, I do think we’ve heard the message clearly that this is important for industry and
36 represents a priority for them. I don’t want to, you know, shine the light on NMFS but there are
37 some items that the Council has approved that they have not been able to move forward on
38 implementation with, which also represented priority issues for the industry. And then, this
39 week we’ve also heard from the GAP other priority issues that would be new initiatives include
40 the widow QS allocation and the removal of the RCA boundaries. And so I’m trying to balance,
41 kind of all of these competing priorities that industry has and I’m not sure I got a clear answer in
42 public testimony as to where folks saw EM fitting into all of those priorities. And I think at the
43 March Council meeting we had a considerable discussion here about looking ahead at the 15-16
44 spex cycle that we’re about to embark upon, the completion of the amendment 24 tier 1 EIS
45 which we recognize might not be done by June but we’re still hoping, we’re still striving to get it
46 done by that time. So I think we’ve got a lot on our plate already. When I look ahead at the
47 year-at-a-glance and Council meeting and Council discussion. I also think that when I look at
48 the items on the table here and I’m on page 7 over the workshop report, and I think that we do

1 need to have some information from field studies or EFPs that help us make an informed
2 decision about whether to develop EM alternatives and maybe for which sectors of which
3 portions of the fishery. And set some priorities from that standpoint. And we're really not going
4 to have the results of those studies or EFPs until this later time frame. So I do think that while
5 it's good to allow NMFS to allow EFPs potentially to continue as their developing the full
6 regulatory package, I want some information up front. So the way I see this is we're actually
7 getting a request from the industry that they want an exemption to observer coverage. They want
8 an EFP for the entire industry right not to be exempt from observer coverage and to have the
9 flexibility to take either an observer or a camera and I think that before the Council decides that
10 we want that to happen we need to have some data, some science, some insurance that we're
11 going to be able to achieve this individual accountability of catch and bycatch. And we also
12 need to be able to talk about whether we are going to be able to achieve it to varying degrees by
13 sector or by fishery. And are there some sectors or fisheries we might want to move forward
14 with, first and then consider others later perhaps as the technology catches up with our
15 performance standards. And, again I think even with the, my proposed revised schedule, it is
16 still ambitious because there are a lot of issues and nuances that we will need to consider in
17 building this package.

18 **{Stop Time 1:00:50}**

19

20 *[See page 10 for amendment to the motion on the floor at the end of the day.]*

21

22 **ADJOURNED FOR DAY**

23

24 **APRIL 10, 2013 – AGENDA ITEM D.7.f - CONTINUED**

25

26 **4-10-13am1Copy.mp3**

27 **{Start Time 0:01:50}**

28 Crabbe: ...The wording in the amendment is fairly prescriptive but the information above that
29 allows room for flexibility. I was wondering if it was allowing room for flexibility to move
30 faster than the prescriptive language. So that was my question to the maker of the amendment.

31

32 Wolford: Michelle

33

34 Culver: Well, yes. Flexibility goes both ways and so what I'm trying to do with the amendment
35 is to be a little bit more realistic so that there are not higher expectations on the part of the public
36 that we're going to get something done sooner and so I am trying to put together a realistic
37 schedule understanding that it is flexible one way or another. If we got done earlier, well bonus,
38 that's great. My understanding from side conversations with NMFS is that the schedule as
39 presented on page 7 is such that NMFS rulemaking final for implementation probably would not
40 occur until late 2016 maybe even early 2017. And under my proposed amendment I think that's
41 the exact same schedule, would be pretty much implementation late 2016 early 2017. So my
42 understanding is that the bottom line in terms of implementation really doesn't change because
43 of the workload that's involved in all of the steps and the small amount of staff that we have to
44 dedicate to this. But I've also heard that perhaps the Council is expecting or is going to receive
45 some funds from NMFS to hire a couple of additional staff to work on this item. And that that
46 needs to happen here in 2013. So maybe Frank could speak to both the timing of implementation
47 and those funds that are coming to the Council for this effort and when that needs to happen.

48 **{Stop Time 0:04:17}**

1
2 *[Lockhart: responded*

3 *McIsaac: Asked from some clarity on the calendar on page 7 of the workshop report.*

4 *Seeger: Reviewed the calendar and responded to a question from the chair and from Ms.*
5 *Culver on the reference to special studies in the workshop calendar.]*

6
7 **{Start Time 0:15:48}**

8 Lowman: Just so we are really clear, because, Frank you said that it can take up to two years, but
9 we have 16 months in this schedule for 2016, so even 2 years would be partly through 2016 if it
10 slipped a little bit in this schedule. In the schedule which is in the amendment where you would
11 have the FPA selected in November of 2015 my math says that there is no way you could have
12 the same start date as this schedule because that is an additional year and one or two months
13 where then your one 16 mo. to two year process would start. So I don't see how they can be
14 implemented at the same time if you drop the selection of an FPA by a year and two months.

15
16 Lockhart: I'm not sure that as a question but right now this one gives us 16 months to hopefully
17 have something in place at the beginning of 2016 and the other schedule has us starting in 2015.
18 Again given what I know about these equipment based things I do think once a final decision is
19 made it takes up to two years to do it . but again it depends on what the final decision is. So...

20
21 Lowman: So it does seem like you would have a delay of at least of a year because your making
22 your...So, I have one other clarification for Jim, in terms of, I know you've had some discussions
23 on developing performance standards and what you might be able to report back in June and
24 perhaps refine, thinking of this as a special study in September.

25
26 Seeger: Yes we've been talking about: first, one of the things is what's available for the
27 production of the whitepaper, keeping in mind that there were 7 national white papers that were
28 turned out and presented at the CCC meeting, talking with Dayna Matthews and Colby Brady,
29 two of the people who would be working on the whitepaper. They feel there is a substantial
30 amount of material in those documents that we'd be able to draw on. And we have some staff
31 that would be working on that document. And the feeling in those discussions is that we can
32 produce, at a minimum a policy document that would have substantial information for you and
33 perhaps some areas where we would need some additional guidance from the Council by June, if
34 not a complete document by June. Keeping in mind that when we talk about performance
35 standards, that's a very nebulous concept. There are a lot of different ways to specify
36 performance standards so there might be some questions that would come back in June. We
37 think we could have a substantial document for you at the June meeting and at that time you
38 could see whether or not that met all your needs.

39
40 Culver. When I spoke the amendment yesterday before we broke for the evening, what I was
41 trying to describe is that I didn't think that in reality even if we had this schedule on paper on
42 page 7, that we would be prepared to select a final preferred alternative in September of 2014.
43 And the types of things I was taking into consideration were just the fact that we would have
44 very little information available to us. We would not have had any EFPs perhaps or maybe we
45 would have one year of EFP by September of 2014. There'd be very little data for which we
46 would be able to base a decision on in terms of saying yes, electronic monitoring will accomplish
47 the goals and objectives that we've identified. Added to that I also thought that the Council had
48 some fairly large workload items on its plate relative to the 15-16 spex. And the amendment 24

1 tier 1 EIS. As well as implementation of the items that we've already adopted. And so I didn't
2 see I guess, this was my question to Frank, was I understand two years from the time we take a
3 final action, but my question was more given your staff resources do you see us being able to
4 reach a final action by September of 2014. And I'm thinking in reality given everything that is
5 on our plate I don't see that happening. So again, the purpose of my amendment is to try and
6 give industry a little bit more of a realistic picture of expectation of that then their not coming if
7 our schedule should slip, their not coming to us and saying hey, you said you were going to get
8 this done 6 months ago or a year ago, why haven't you don't it yet. I'd rather they say hey great
9 you got it done a meeting or two early, that would be nice to hear for once.

10
11 Kirchner: So I just wanted to make sure that I understood Frank's answer on implementation
12 timing. And so if we make a decision in September 2014, then reasonable implementation we
13 would have would be maybe June of 2016, September 2016, somewhere in there. IF we make a
14 final decision in November 2015, 5r4easonable implementation timing would be maybe June-
15 July of 2017 of November 2017, something like that.

16
17 Lockhart:...it depends and do I'm not trying to be facetious but ...if you were to assume the same
18 decision, just for argument sake, the Council comes to the same decision and that decision
19 involves setting either doing a type approval or setting some sort of a minimum standards for a
20 reasonably complex system, yes, that's going to take well over a year. In the past it's taken two
21 years. If at the end of that time period the council comes to a very simple electronic monitoring
22 system, potentially that could be quicker, how much quicker I don't' know. But yes, using past
23 history once on these types of issues coming up with a regulatory package that addresses all the
24 things that we need to address to set up something that people could go out and have some sort
25 of a electronic monitoring system takes about two years.

26 **{Stop Time: 0:23:56}**

27
28 *[Crabbe: could different sectors move at different paces?*

29 *Lockhart: yes*

30 *McIsaac: discussed commission field season.*

31 *Crabbe: Council should send message we're listening, message with original language is*
32 *we are going as fast as we can. Spoke to industry priorities.*

33 *Lowman: Spoke in opposition to the amendment.]*

34
35 **Amendment 1a:** to strike from Amendment 1 "*Scoping to begin in the summer of 2014;*
36 *this would push the other items described in the table to the selection of a FPA to*
37 *Nov 2015"*

38 Moved By: Dale Myer

Seconded by: Michele Culver

39 Amendment 1a

Amendment 1

40
41 *[Myers spoke to amendment.]*

42
43 **{Start Time: 0:32:33}**

44 Culver: ...The real purpose of my amendment that I tried to get at was just making sure we had
45 sufficient time to develop the whitepaper for the performance standards which is captured in the
46 first sentence. By keeping this on the Council schedule and having this come back in September
47 and November allows us to have a discussion in November about where to we go from here.
48 And, as I mentioned after we develop the performance standards we might get a different

1 reaction from industry or from some sectors of the industry about whether or not they think
2 electronic monitoring is still a high priority for their sector. And I think we'll get those kinds of
3 comments once we've set up some performance standards and some sideboards so right now
4 industry's having these discussions but their not clear about because we haven't made it clear.
5 But their not clear about what the sideboards are what kind of penalties and consequences there
6 could potentially be, what kind of structure we might put to this program whether we'd have full
7 retention or not, what they'd have to retain. Does that include dogfish or not. Those types of
8 questions and so once we set up here's how it could work perhaps they could have a more
9 informed discussion about whether or not that would work for them. And so I think this is a
10 good compromise which kind of gets us at the initial steps but doesn't really speak to kind of
11 how long the entire process is going to take, which is difficult to decide now when we don't even
12 have the performance standards developed.

13
14 Wolford: Gway

15
16 Kirchner: Thank you Mr. Chairman, so if what we got in September was just a fantastic
17 document that didn't need any further review, do we have the flexibility to then move scoping
18 up?

19
20 Wolford: Frank:

21
22 Lockhart: I was going to ask this question but its very pertinent what she's saying. This
23 amendment if approved ...envisions scoping starting in June. So scoping has already been
24 moved up before September. With that amendment, that's the effect of it.

25
26 Wolford: Dr. McIsaac

27
28 McIsaac: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Lockhart would literally be correct, based on move
29 forward the process as shown on page 7 , however, I think yesterday there was a motion passed
30 that said begin scoping in September. So if this amendment passes we were going to bring up
31 that point of clarification. Because it looks like there's a conflict, so we'd want some resolution
32 consolidating what is listed on the schedule of June and September into September or is the
33 intent of the maker to be exact as to moving forward the process as shown. So there would b e a
34 conflict but it depends on if this amendment passes. I think there may even be more
35 clarifications.

36
37 Culver: Thanks. I would answer the question, Gway's question as yes, we could actually move
38 up scoping and begin sooner if we thought performance standards were fine in September. But
39 this is, I guess I would go back tot he question I raised yesterday to NMFS that I don't recall if I
40 got an answer, was whether or not this needed a two meeting process, that is to have a two
41 meeting process to adopt performance standards for electronic monitoring....[continued by
42 identifying some alternatives for Lockhart to respond to]

43
44 Lockhart:In my mind these performance standards were essentially a policy statement and not
45 a final decision. The real final decision is when the Council selects a final preferred alternative.
46 To me the Council does not need a two meeting process to develop performance standards. In
47 fact, I think how it's going to work is that there will be performance standards and they will be

1 modified as the discussion occurs and we learn more. So I don't think it would require a two
2 meeting process.

3 **{Stop Time: 0:37:57}**

4
5 *Crabbe: [question on scoping doc in June and what could happen. Addressed to Myer.]*

6
7 **{Start Time: 0:39:13}**

8 Myer: ...I'm just assuming the scoping document would, we could start in September. I don't
9 know if the scoping document could be done, but I think it has to be started in September.

10
11 Lowman: ...In my mind that would be appropriate. We'd have these performance standards,
12 hopefully they'd be so great we wouldn't want to make any modifications but I think the scoping
13 could inform our discussion on the standards too as we're sort of giving final direction for what
14 that will be those basis. So, I think that makes sense to me.

15 **{StopTime: 0:40:08}**

16
17 **[Amendment to amendment (Amendment 1a) passed unanimously.]**

18
19 *[Wolford – Noted the importance of catch accounting to the IQ Program and the*
20 *urgencies from the fleets pending assumption of costs for observers.*

21 *McIsaac stated – implication of motion, scoping not begin until November but let staff*
22 *review.*

23 *Seger – reviewed motion from previous day.*

24 ***Kirchner asked what “completed” means.***

25
26 **{Start Time: 0:44:16}**

27 Culver: I would assume that when we had the performance standards that the Council would
28 have some sort of action taken to approve them as these are the ones we are going forward with.
29 That is what I would assume would be completed.

30
31 Wolford: In fact, I think that is my recollection of the discussion we had. That it would in fact
32 come to the Council and the Council would essentially say it was completed.

33
34 Kirchner: So number 3 says to direct the Council staff to "develop" a white paper and then we
35 delay scoping until the whitepaper is developed. Developed means it's presented to the Council?
36 The Council actually adopts fully the performance measures that we'll move forward on? I'm
37 not seeing a connection.

38
39 Wolford: Dorothy

40
41 Lowman: So when I voted for the amendment on this first one I was thinking that we were not
42 doing this until we developed, we were doing the development of the whitepaper, we weren't
43 waiting until we finally said "yes" these are our final ones. On our previous discussion on this
44 amendment, we talked about how if we got that in September and we initiated scoping, which
45 would have some little scoping document that would be part of initiating scoping in September,
46 that those two would go together and we'd be talking about them and both would. We'd get an
47 initial scoping and we would get some Council discussion and refinement of the performance
48 standards in September. So I don't see it that we would have to wait until the Council finally felt

1 completely comfortable at the last revision they ever wanted on performance standards before we
2 even began development of scoping. So I saw from our discussion that we would essentially be
3 starting scoping in September and whatever preparatory materials would be done in time for the
4 September meeting.

5
6 Wolford: Gway

7
8 Kirchner: That was how I understood it as well so I wanted to be clear on it.

9
10 McIsaac: Good clarity.

11
12 Wolford [now back on amendment]

13
14 Culver: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, I don't disagree with Dorothy and Gway and
15 their interpretation. But, we do have the caveat that we kept here at the beginning of #1 so
16 presumably as we set Council agenda in June for September, we can talk about whether or not
17 we're ready to initiate scoping. Where we are with the whitepaper, whether that's going to be
18 ready. And schedule it accordingly for September or November. But we'll have that
19 conversation. There's flexibility here.

20
21 Wolford: Dorothy

22
23 Lowman: I totally agree and I also think we talked about a check-in in June on how it's
24 progressing, any questions and when we get to future agenda planning we'll have more
25 discussion on that.

26 **{Stop Time: 0:48:05}**

27
28 **[Amendment 1 and Motion 21 carried unanimously.]**

29
30 **APRIL 11, 2013 - AGENDA ITEM B.7.d**

31
32 **4-11-13pm1Copy.mp3**

33
34 *[During staff overview, McIsaac referenced Sept and Nov, initial performance standards*
35 *in Sept, complete in Nov (Time 32:30); and referenced June EM check-in on how things*
36 *are going (Time 37:00).]*

37
38 *[Culver asked, with respect to trawl trailing actions]*

39
40 **{Time 43:01}**

41 Culver: Is what's envisioned in June on the guidance on regulation development. Would we then
42 also be discussing our priorities and whether we want in September to scope PIE 3 and gear
43 workshop and AMP and all of that?

44 McIsaac: I think there's enough time for that to be an eligible state of discussion. What is in
45 designed in September is the more routine annual process of September, November and beyond."

46
47 *[Reports and public comment. Council action. In her summary at the end Ms. Culver*
48 *describes the June action with respect to PIE 3 as]*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

{Time 1:48:40}

Culver: “a prioritization of trailing actions in general to come in September and beyond.”

[McIsaac: agreed except with respect to the June Check-in and PIE 3]

{Start Time 1:50:18}

McIsaac: “on the matter of trawl rationalization and consideration of priorities. In September is the annual call for priorities, what’s out there. And it’s listed here as PIE 3 but it’s kind of viewed generally as the next go round. Scope what priorities there are. AMP is scheduled as a consideration there. So when you initially spoke to that it is some sort of a preview of what is coming in September. When you spoke to it before I wasn’t sure if it was anything different form a preview.

Culver: No just a preview.

Lowman: So just to expand on that because I do think we are going to be needing to do a really thoughtful decision about what our priorities are. I don’t think we should be, I think it’s fine to do a preview, talking about the kind of data we’d need to do a very measured cost benefit prioritization, a little bit about what we think is the most important to go forward first in September but I wasn’t seeing that [in June] we’d make hard decisions about what would come off [the list] in September.

Culver: Just a better understanding of what they are.

{End Time 1:51:35}