

Pribilof Islands Collaborative Steering Committee Meeting

**February 4, 2005** 9:00am AK teleconference

Planning and Steering Committee meeting

Agenda and meeting summary

NOTE: Action items are highlighted in yellow

**The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be Wednesday February 9<sup>th</sup> at 9:00am Alaska time (10:00am Seattle time, 1:00pm DC time).**

**Present:**

*9:00am Steering Committee discussion*-Denise Woods, Margaret Williams, Heather McCarty, Randy Hagenstein, Aquilina Lestenkof

*9:30am NFS meeting debrief*- Denise Woods, Margaret Williams, Heather McCarty, Randy Hagenstein, Aquilina Lestenkof, Phil Zavidil, Lori Swanson, Karl Haflinger, Larry Cotter, John Bengtson, Rolf Ream, and Doug Demaster

**Agenda**

1. Steering Committee business
  - a. Meg's end of contract- how to wrap up
  - b. What to do with output from NFS meeting (Conceptual model, action items etc)
2. NFS meeting debrief
  - a. Comments from callers/ meeting participants
  - b. Discussion of how to follow up/ next meeting

**Conference Call Summary**

- Heather reminds the group that our work (and meetings) are noticed by the NPFMC; need to be sure we reassure them we are not trying to bypass or redo the work of the NPFMC- reinforce that we expect any ideas we have will have to be passed through them to proceed.

1. Meg's end of contract- how to wrap up

- Meg has indicated that she will no longer continue her work as facilitator for the PIC when her contract ends on February 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Meg will complete her contract obligations (produce Executive Summary) by Feb 18<sup>th</sup>.
- **Action: Margaret will draft a letter thanking Meg for her hard work; Denise will circulate to Steering Committee and send final draft (hard copy) to Meg**
- Need to discuss if we need a full-time facilitator or just for major meetings; also who will handle the administrative work Meg used to do? See next SC meeting agenda

2. What to do with output from NFS meeting (Conceptual model, action items etc)

- Discussion about industry concerns that the Action Item list and Conceptual Model (which were both in draft form when we ended the NFS meeting) not be distributed until there is agreement on the contents.

- Regarding Conceptual Model: Brock is addressing this concern by amending the notes that had accompanied the boxes on the model. The notes now ONLY elaborate on the brief description in the boxes (where needed) and DO NOT include references to the data or interpretations of the data.
  - Draft conceptual model will be circulated among the steering committee when received by Denise
- Regarding Action Item list and other possible outputs: We cannot censor the contents of the list that was brainstormed by the group at the meeting. Instead, we need to be sure we emphasize that the list does not represent any form of consensus and that most ideas were not even discussed, just listed. This list will not be circulated outside the steering committee at this time.

### 3. NFS meeting debrief- comments from callers

- Comments from NOAA participants: Said the meeting was like a mini-symposium on the NFS, presented a tremendous amount of information- some of which felt new, even to some of the researchers; an opportunity for the agencies to hear from their constituents and be reassured their research agenda matches the concerns of the constituents; it was helpful to focus on research needs and gaps (conceptual model was helpful for this).
- Margaret: Agree with positives (including such large industry representation). Thanks the researchers for their huge investment of time and energy. Concerned that there was not closure at the end of day 3- the list of actions was not discussed.
- Aquilina: Expresses thanks, too. LTKW collection she did helped affirm that people's concerns/ questions are part of groups' research agendas. Still feel urgency but are moving in the right direction. Still need to focus on ecosystem based management.
- Larry: Thanks and admires work of NMFS presenters. Verified that 1) the situation is very serious, 2) the agency is taking it seriously 3) the agency sees the value of a consensus process. One person from the Islands told him they thought there would be no value to seeing more numbers, but ended up finding it fascinating. Wished we had another day to finish the discussion from the end of day 3 (actions) and to ask and answer more questions. We got a common education but had no time to develop where our commonalities lie.
- Randy: Also grateful for researchers participation- is pleased we mad headway on getting on the same page with what's known and not.
- Lori: Speaking for her, Paul, and Thorn- were incredibly impressed with the LTKW presentations (i.e. subsistence harvest). Thorn did not think there was established a nexus between northern fur seals and fisheries.
- Phil: Need to find a way to balance comments from the public with the limited time allotted to the formal stakeholders for discussion. Need to work on the Conceptual Model so it reflects relative certainty/ strength of the factors it identifies. Maybe too much focus on pollock fishery; concerned about other fisheries (i.e. trawl) too.
- Heather: Richard Zaharof said to her that all of his concerns and observations with respect to the LTKW perspective were covered. We didn't stick to the agenda and have our evening session to brainstorm action ideas: thus, we didn't get as far as we needed to in this area.
- Karl: We need a way to write down and agree on what we all saw as the most significant points made at the meeting. (see below)

#### 4. Discussion of how to follow up/ next meeting

- Proposed: Have each constituent group meet to synthesize and distill the information from the meeting and create a list of the top 5 or 6 elements as they see them (perhaps including a sentence describing the data they heard that support their position). The lists could be sent to Denise, who will forward them to Doug Demaster when all are received; Doug could pass them to NMFS researchers (which ones?) who would comment on them collectively (need discuss how this works). The idea is to take the reviewed lists and see how much overlap we have- if common understanding exists. Then we can start with this common understanding at the next major meeting (see below)
  - Proposed that the lists be created and sent to Denise by February 21 (she will email to John B., cc Doug)
- There is concern that this method will mean the follow up occurs via email, in a vacuum. To be further discussed at Feb 9 Steering Committee meeting.
- Discussion of next meeting date: propose March 7-9 in Seattle at NMFS Trainer Conference room
  - Would need travel funding for Island participants
  - Need a facilitator ASAP