

**RecFIN Steering Committee**  
**Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission**  
**Portland, Oregon**  
**January 11, 2018**

**Attendees:**

Randy Fisher, PSMFC  
Steve Williams, PSMFC  
Chuck Tracy, PFMC  
John DeVore, PFMC  
Kevin Duffy, NOAA

Heather Reed, WDFW  
Ed Bowles, ODFW  
Caren Braby, ODFW  
Craig Shuman, CDFW  
Katie Perry, CDFW

**1. Welcome/Introductions -**

**2. Purpose and goals of meeting –**

Randy Fisher opened the meeting with a general description of how and why the committee was asked to meet. An overview of the general topics for the day's discussion, including grant timing, budget allocations and overall RecFIN Subcommittee roles and responsibilities, were described.

CDFW representatives expressed interest in understanding more about the RecFIN database and future development. ODFW expressed interest in discussing continuation of the existing grant.

**3. Overview of Sub-Committees –** See attachments with lists of committees, explanations and member names.

Steve Williams provided an overview of the subcommittees, their purpose, a discussion of who is currently on the Committees and a description of their most recent activities. Only the Technical Committee (meets twice per year) and the Statistical Committee have met in recent years.

Steve also described the use of a new ShareFile location (<https://psmfc.sharefile.com/d-s7811732b72f4529a>) for documentation of RecFIN activities. Interest in adding historical files and documenting past RecFIN committee activities was expressed by several on the committee. PSMFC staff agreed to include this information when available.

**4. Policy Guidance on purpose of the RecFIN Database -** See attachments.

Randy Fisher opened the discussion by describing the need for a decision by the Steering Committee on the purpose and structure of the newly developed RecFIN Database. Randy referenced materials distributed to the Steering Committee, which included;

- RecFIN Coop Agreement for July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2006
- RecFIN Coop Agreement for July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018
- Special Award Conditions for NA15NMF4370417

Based on these documents PSMFC is operating under the assumption that the RecFIN database and the associated data is to be set up in a centralized database and should include all components of recreational data collected by federal and state sampling programs.

Each committee member was asked to articulate their position or understanding of the purpose and role of the RecFIN Database.

California expressed a number of concerns regarding the concept of RecFIN as a centralized database for all West Coast recreational data. They indicated that they had not been working under the centralized database assumption. They agreed that federally funded data should be part of the database but had questions about sampling data collected under other state-funded programs. They expressed concerns about when and who was involved in making the decision regarding the centralized database approach and about data security and confidentiality. They ultimately expressed their support for the concept of a centralized database containing both federal- and state-funded data but indicated that they still had some work to do internally to implement this approach. No timeline for implementation was discussed.

Oregon described their support for the centralized database that will be used for decision-making. Oregon is working towards the umbrella concept for data systems. The future is evolving into coordinated databases and to be as transparent as possible while respecting, where appropriate, the confidential nature of the data. Future funding is a concern.

Washington is in agreement with making the RecFIN database a one-stop shop. They are also working to add historical data into the database. They share concerns about confidentiality as well.

NOAA, PSMFC, and the PFMC members of the committee all supported the concept of RecFIN as the centralized database for West Coast recreational fisheries data. Members spoke to the fact that a database of this type would allow better management of fisheries and the scientific data that supports that management.

## **5. Saltonstall-Kennedy Funding Allocations**

Randy Fisher described the SK funding process and indicated that NMFS never knows how much funding they will receive annually. He described the task before the Steering Committee as needing to decide how to allocate the currently available \$275K of SK funds and how do we want to address future funding. Committee members asked if a specific formula was being used to allocate the current RecFIN base funding and if so, could it be used for allocating the SK Funding? Randy Fisher indicated that no good formula has been developed or used to allocate the \$2.2M in RecFIN base funding. The Committee reviewed the current base funding allocations (see attached) and indicated their general support for those allocations. However, they also recognized that the allocation of funding beyond base levels would be difficult using the splits.

Steve Williams reviewed the SK funding priority list (see attached) developed by members of the Technical Committee and the equal sharing of funding that had been used to allocate the two previous allocations of SK funding.

Each state described in detail the project or projects they had listed on the priority list. After some discussion regarding the priorities and needs of each state, and the region as a whole, the decision was made to allocate the available funds in the following manner:

- \$172K - Angler License Telephone and E Survey Comparison
- \$103K - Washington Puget Sound Halibut Sampling in 2018
- \$0 - Oregon agreed to forgo an allocation of funding in 2017/18 in exchange for being given first priority for any additional future SK funding that may come available next year.

Committee members expressed an interest in having the Technical Committee develop a running list of projects that are scalable and would be available for Steering Committee review when funding becomes available. Steve Williams agreed to work with the Technical Committee to provide a priority list for future funding.

#### **6. Regional Implementation Planning -**

Steve Williams reviewed the purpose and need for development of a Regional Implementation Plan. The group discussed the NMFS guidelines for development of the plan and reviewed the list of priorities (see attached) developed by the RecFIN Technical Committee. Steve Williams described the process for development of the final plan narratives by various Technical Committee members. A final draft of the Plan will be made available for review by the Steering Committee prior to submission to NMFS.

#### **7. Next Steps –**

Oregon suggested and the group concurred that the RecFIN Steering Committee should get together at the fall PSMFC Annual meeting and touch base on any policy issues needing discussion.

#### **8. Closing -**