

- Comments:
 - *Pro-University-* Less expensive rate (approx. \$150/day vs. \$275/day downtown), “captive audience”, convenient food service at cafeteria-saves PIC money on catering)
 - *Pro-downtown-* save on rental car cost, could be problem parking at University on weekends
 - Meg and Denise will check on room capacity and report at next planning meeting for final decision.
2. Discussion and decision re: use of conceptual model tool
- Randy leads the group through the conceptual model example he developed for rats/ seabirds highlighting where interventions could be applied and where question marks remain.
 - Comments on value of this proposed conceptual model:
 - A visual product can get everyone on the same page with respect to where questions/ gaps are
 - Will highlight synergy across major issues. When we have developed a model for each element (i.e. halibut, crab, seabirds etc.) there will be areas of overlap and we will begin to get at an ecosystem approach by seeing linkages affecting multiple biological and human components.
 - Gets us around the pattern of across-the-table accusations and denials
 - Helps us articulate hypotheses with the experts’ input
 - Specifically addresses objectives 1,3 and 4 (from Draft fur seal meeting plan)
 - Functions as a tool to integrate all the information being delivered/ discussed on days 1 and 2 in a way that “sets us straight” and keeps us honest with what we all heard the experts say
 - Allows us to evaluate and identify where data gaps do NOT allow us to draw conclusions or suggest actions, i.e. helps us accept or reject or question hypotheses (threats)
 - Quickly eliminates need to spend time discussing hypotheses (threats) that are not considered by the experts to be viable; focuses the group’s effort where it can make real progress
 - Concerns with this proposed conceptual model:
 - Would be suitable only for threats to the “biological” or “environmental” components of the Pribilof Islands; how would it address economic and human components?
 - See inclusion of Aleuts and Fisheries in Rat Model example; model can be modified to include whatever we want it to
 - The meeting was supposed to focus on presenting and learning from the *available* data on fur seals and fisheries and for review of the current hypotheses, not to determine cause and effect (e.g. NMFS letter cautions they will not be able to determine the cause of the decline or the effect of fisheries by January).
 - This model does not propose to determine cause and effect, not to draw conclusions other than those that can be supported by

the information presented by the experts; the model is a tool to help efficiently sort through hypotheses and identify where there are information gaps and where we can agree on effective actions

- Proposed model would require further development to explicitly address these concerns
 - **Suggested additions:**
 - Have the experts present the current hypotheses on the fur seal decline prior to beginning the conceptual model exercise
 - Would be very helpful if subgroup of Formal Stakeholders participated in “dry run” of model prior to January so that some members of the full group would have experience with the modeling process and the group could work more efficiently
3. Alternative model proposed (Paul M.)
- Paul proposes an alternative conceptual model similar to that developed by Bullen et al. for their Steller sea lion report to the Council
 - This model proposes a methodical way to look at hypotheses regarding a marine mammal population decline
 - **Denise will circulate the Bullen et al. report to all PIC participants (sent to all Nov 4)**
 - Discussion will proceed on this item on November 10 planning meeting
4. NMFS letter (reply to PIC info request)
- Heather read from the letter, highlighting the need to address hypotheses in a fact-based way.
 - **Denise will circulate the NMFS letter to all PIC participants (sent to all Nov 4)**
 - Discussion will proceed on this item on November 10 planning meeting
5. Review of draft agenda for January meeting:
- a. amount of time allocated to each topic
 - Experts will be asked how much time they will need (following further refinement of what we will be asking each to speak about)
 - b. additions or deletions
 - Add:
 - Information on characteristics of overfished or depleted populations of fish worldwide (how do they get that way, do they recover, how long does that take..?)
 - Status of fisheries on NFS migration corridor (to Washington and Oregon)
 - Doug D. confirms these data will be presented
 - State representative to address herring and crab issues, if they arise (managed by State)
 - Kaja Brix and/or Dave Cormany can likely present the latest NFS Conservation Plan draft

- L&TK input from other than fisherpeople of St. George and St. Paul; need hear observations of people fishing throughout the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere (i.e. the Pribilof Islanders' observations are too little data)
 - Delete:
 - Time for #7 (subsistence harvest): Debbie confirms that this information could be presented in written format for the Study Guide
 - Debbie will provide the Annual Subsistence Harvest Reports and Draft EIS
 - Next steps:
 - Debbie, Max and Andy will talk with Henry Huntington following the Data Workgroup meeting (Mon 9:00am) to determine what questions would be useful to ask and decide if this information will be useful for the PIC at this time- then report to Steering Committee during next planning meeting (Tuesday 8:30am)
 - Steering Committee will then determine (1) if a written L&TK product is worth having Dr. Huntington do and (2) if the PIC will pay for it
- c. decision re: addressing objectives 6 & 7 (**discussion tabled until Wednesday November 10, 10:00am)

II- Steering Committee Agenda: (**discussion tabled until Tuesday November 9, 8:30am)