

## **C9 EM Integration**

### **MOTION #1**

The AP recommends that the Council adopt Alternative 2 - Integrating EM into the Observer Program. We further recommend the Council adopt Option A to utilize EM as a monitoring tool when vessels are fishing multiple IFQ areas.

*Motion passed 19-0.*

#### **Rationale:**

- Alternative 2 Option A is preferred as it aligns best with the Purpose and Need Statement and Council objectives and is the preferred alternative recommended by the EM work group and public testimony.
- Alternative 2 Option A most closely aligns with current partial coverage stratum.

### **MOTION #2**

The AP also recognizes the value of the collaborative effort of the EM Workgroup amongst agencies, Council staff and Industry representatives and recommends that the Council continue the EM Workgroup process and provide staff support to develop the analytical tools necessary to address cost, monitoring strategies, and enforcement concerns.

The AP recommends that the Council clarify their intent of integrating EM in the fixed-gear fleet is to optimize coverage for fixed-gear vessels and should not diminish coverage in other sectors.

The AP concurs with the Workgroup recommendation to initiate a Discussion Paper in order to identify key aspects and the practicality of moving vessels <40 ft fleet out of the zero selection pool. The AP is concerned about the impact of shifting 500- 600 vessels from the zero selection pool with no additional fees reducing the effectiveness of the Program.

The AP finds it important to continue developing the EM program with cost effectiveness in mind and recommends that the Council express their intent in that development to explore the utility of cost-saving measures such as: multiple service providers and local data review.

*Motion passed 19-0.*

#### **Rationale:**

- These recommendations from the AP and EM work group are essential to further advancement of EM and the North Pacific Observer Program.