G.3 Electronic Monitoring Update

Council Action:

ORAFTANOT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES Provide Guidance on Program Implementation and

PAGE 1 OF 3
DOCUMENT1

Motion by Phil Anderson Second by Bob Dooley

I move that the Council write a letter to NMFS that:

- 1. Describes our desire to continue to work collaboratively with NMFS and affected stakeholders to develop and implement an EM program that effectively meets our goals and objectives with particular emphasis on the cost-effectiveness of the program for the groundfish industry and the wise use of public funds, and
- 2. References the apparent changes in NMFS' policies relative to the use of a sole source contract model with the PSMFC based on the recent action taken by the NPFMC and the use of cost recovery dollars to fulfill an industry cost obligation, and
- 3. Asks NMFS for a specific explanation of why the PFMC cannot use the model that the NPFMC is pursuing relative to sole source contracting with PSMFC and the funding alternatives for the industry to meet its obligations, and
- 4. States the Council's position that it is imperative that a change is made to the EM rule of June 2019 prior to its implementation that, among other things, removes the third-party model contained in the rule, and
- 5. Recognizes that, NMFS can move forward with implementing the final EM rule including the guidelines and program manual consistent with the implementation date of January 1, 2022 even if the Council believes a new direction needs to be taken, and
- 6. Emphasizes the need to modify the rule before it is implemented to meet the program goals and objectives and one that is accepted and embraced by the fishing industry to ensure high participation rates, and
- 7. Emphasizes the importance of using all the tools at our disposal to achieve a cost effective EM program and linking that outcome to the future success of the groundfish fishery, and
- 8. Expresses support to use cost recovery dollars up to the 3% cap to offset NMFS' costs associated with the grant to PSMFC for video review and storage under the EFP and in the longer term when the program is under permanent regulations.
- 9. Requests that NMFS delay implementation of the EM regulations until such time that the Council can develop a recommendation to amend the final rule in a manner that takes full

advantage of the ability to implement the program utilizing a sole source contract with PSMFC for video review and data storage, and addresses the concerns associated with data confidentiality, and

10. Request the 2021 EM EFP be extended through 2022 with the addition that cost recovery dollars be charged to the Mothership and Shorebased sectors to reimburse NMFS for the able .'S based

S based

RAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

ORAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSE

ORAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

ORAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

ORAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

ORAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

ORAFT, MOTEOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPO PSMFC's actual cost for video review and data storage. If insufficient funds are available from cost recovery, EFP sponsors will be responsible for the balance identified by NMFS based on the PSMFC's actual annual cost.

Motion passed. Mr. Ryan Wulff abstained.