

**Draft Meeting Summary  
DCTF Executive Committee  
Friday, August 26, 2016**

*Meeting Participants*

EC Members Present            Geoff Bettencourt, Bill Carvalho, Larry Collins, Mike Cunningham, Vince Doyle

EC Members Absent            Bill Blue, Brett Fahning

Other Meeting Participants    Ruth Flores, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Christy Juhasz, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Pete Kalvass, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Pat Kennelly, CA Department of Public Health  
Susan Klasing, Office of Environmental Health and Hazard Assessment  
Emily Knight, Ocean Science Trust  
Sonke Mastrup, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Maria Melchiorre, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Cpt. Bob Puccinelli, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Cpt. Steve Riske, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Lt. Andy Roberts, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Craig Shuman, CA Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Tom Weseloh, Senator McGuire's Office  
Holly Wyer, Ocean Protection Council

Rachelle Fisher, DCTF Administrative Team  
Kelly Sayce, DCTF Administrative Team

Meeting Summary

*All "next steps" are in bold below.*

1. *Welcome, introductions, agenda overview*
  - The DCTF Administrative Team (Admin Team) introduced call participants and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The purpose of the call is to provide updates on disaster relief, the lost fishing gear recovery program, the current whale entanglement issue facing the Dungeness crab fishery, accounting of the Dungeness crab trap limit program account, etc. The Dungeness Crab Task Force (DCTF) Executive Committee (EC) will also discuss the [CDFW, CDPH, and OEHHA's memo for a potential options for fishing under an advisory](#) and revisit the discussion of the long-term functioning of the DCTF beyond January 2017.
  - The Admin Team explained the EC is a subcommittee of the DCTF. The EC cannot make decisions on behalf of the DCTF and will report back to the full DCTF with the outcomes of this conference call. The EC was directed by the DCTF to address the topic of domoic acid and the long-term functioning of the DCTF during the October 26-27, 2015 DCTF meeting. Additionally, the EC is tasked with moving DCTF recommendations forward, including the lost fishing gear recovery program.
  - Meeting ground rules and [guidelines for providing public comment](#) were reviewed, and the Admin Team walked through the agenda. The Admin Team reminded those on the call that public comments are also

welcomed via email at [info@dungenesscrabtaskforce.com](mailto:info@dungenesscrabtaskforce.com) if they are having trouble getting through on the line. Emailed comments received during the conference call may be read aloud during the call as time permits, and also included in the meeting summary (which may be paraphrased to improve readability). Additionally, those comments received in advance of or immediately following the call will be circulated to the EC and posted on the DCTF webpage.

- The Admin reminded call participants this is a working meeting of the EC. Public comment is welcomed, however will be limited if we are unable to get through the agenda in a timely fashion.
2. *Updates on issues involving the Dungeness crab fishery including, but not limited to, disaster relief efforts, whale entanglements, the Dungeness crab trap tag account, the lost fishing gear recovery program bill (Senate Bill 1287).*
- The Admin Team, along with support from other call participants, walked through a number of updates.
    - *Disaster Relief:* The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has been working closely with Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMC) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to track landings. Final landings information are needed to inform NMFS's decision on whether or not a disaster will be declared. To date, nearly 50% of the five-year average was landed this past Dungeness crab fishing season. These numbers may be updated as new landing receipts are added to the database. If fishermen have any landing receipts that are not yet submitted, NMFS and CDFW request they be submitted immediately to inform NMFS final assessment.
    - *Whale Entanglements:* In response to a steep rise in whale entanglements in Dungeness crab fishing gear, among others, CDFW, California Ocean Protection Council (OPC), and NMFS set up a Working Group to develop recommendations for reducing the risk of whale entanglements in Dungeness crab fishing gear. Since August 2015, the Working Group has met three times in-person and six times via phone. It is composed of commercial and recreational fishermen, NGOs, US Coast Guard, CDFW, and NMFS. The Working Group is investigating options for gear modifications to reduce the risk of entanglements in Dungeness crab gear and options for enhanced data collection to better understand the causes of whale entanglements. Possible recommendations for voluntary actions and/or data collection tools that could be implemented during the 2016-17 fishing season may be made at the Working Group's September 2016 meeting. Recommendations are intended to inform state and federal managers, and the DCTF, in their efforts to understand and respond to the issue of whale entanglements in Dungeness crab fishing gear. More information is available online (<http://www.opc.ca.gov/whale-entanglement-working-group/>)
    - *Dungeness Crab Trap Tag Account:* When the Dungeness crab trap limit program (DCTLP) was established, all funds collected from the sale of trap tags and the biannual permit were directed to be deposited in a dedicated account (the Dungeness Crab Account) to be used to manage the program. CDFW will share an accounting of the Dungeness Crab Account, including fees collected, expenses charged to the account, etc. at the DCTF meeting in October. Around 2011, a claim was made against the state related to charging out of state permit holders a higher annual permit fee than California resident permit holders ([Marilley v. McCamman \(United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-cv-2418-DMR\)](#)). The state recently lost the lawsuit, and it is currently being appealed. If the appeal is not successful, the Department of Finance has directed a portion of the funds for the lawsuit (\$517K) to be taken out of the Dungeness Crab Account to pay for the settlement (see [Assembly Bill 164- Claims Against the State: Payment](#) for additional information).
    - *SB 1287:* The [Whale Protection and Crab Gear Retrieval Act \(aka Senate Bill 1287\)](#) was introduced by Senator McGuire's Office and is an outline for a statewide lost fishing gear retrieval program. The bill was informed and written based on the [DCTF's recommendation](#). As of August 25, the bill passed the Assembly Floor and is now on its way to the Senate floor for concurrence

on Monday August 29. After the Senate floor, it will head to the Governor's desk for signature or veto.

- EC Members discussed the updates.
  - An EC Member asked for additional clarification on the status of the available funds in the Dungeness crab account. He stated the account was created in good faith by the Dungeness crab fleet. The fund was only intended to be used to administer the Dungeness crab trap limit program, not management of the full Dungeness crab fishery, and any surplus in the account was intended to reduce costs to the fishermen or serve as a long-term funding source for the DCTF, should it continue. As of October 2015, CDFW reported a surplus of \$1.2M with additional revenue and expenditures pending.
    - CDFW explained there was an uptick in CDFW's costs in 2015-16, and shortfalls in use of the funds were seen in previous years. Unlike previous years, CDFW spent the full yearly allocation of \$700,000 in the 2015-2016 fiscal year. Costs are catching up to revenue (\$1.4M is received in revenue every two years) and CDFW is no longer seeing a surplus available. It is estimated that approximately \$1.1M is currently in the account, but that amount needs to pay for the 2016-2017 costs and potentially AB 164. A document outlining these accounting numbers will be made available at the October 2016 DCTF meeting.
    - Further clarification was also requested on how CDFW Enforcement and the Licence and Revenue Branch (LRB) accounted for their use of the Dungeness Crab Account.
      - LRB tracks their time on the trap limit program in monthly time sheets.
      - Enforcement expenses are not split up by the DCTLP and general Dungeness crab work. Instead, timesheets are not specific - in-season general patrols are expensed to the Dungeness crab account, while after the season time spent on the Dungeness crab fishery is related to trap retrieval and not charged to the account.
    - A couple of EC Members expressed concern about CDFW's use of the Dungeness crab account and about AB 164. It is difficult to understand why funds from the Dungeness Crab Account are being used for things not related to Dungeness crab (e.g., AB 164) when there are pressing issues for the industry to address (e.g. whale entanglements, long-term function of DCTF, etc.). They expressed it will be difficult to ask the fleet to pay more funds to support the DCTF when they are paying so much for the trap limit program. EC Members requested an accounting of the Dungeness crab account as soon as possible.

### Public Comment

- David Helliwell, commercial fisherman and DCTF Member, stated his constituents were in favor of a gear retrieval program. However, there are concerns that if law requires individuals to pay their fees before renewing their permit, individuals may lose their permit(s) if they can not afford to pay the fees. The program should not be punitive. If an individual is unable to pay for the retrieved traps, those traps should be removed from their total trap allocation instead of losing their permit(s). It is discouraging to hear that the money paid into Dungeness crab account is being used for items other than what it was intended for.
3. *Updates on harmful algal blooms (HABs) (e.g., domoic acid) including, but not limited to, a potential option developed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Department of Public Health, and California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment for fishing under an advisory*

*during future HAB events, regular domoic acid testing as part of annual pre-season crab quality testing, domoic acid protocols, etc.*

- The DCTF began discussing the topic of domoic acid and HABs in October 2015. Anticipating that this might need further discussion, the DCTF tasked the EC to continue discussing this topic and provide guidance to the State. The EC held regular conference calls from November 2015 to March 2016 to discuss the elevated levels of domoic acid. Earlier this month, two documents were released addressing this issue:
  - A [frequently asked questions document](#) that is based on questions generated during the March Executive Committee call and other questions submitted by fishing leadership, agencies and regulators, and others; and
  - A [memo from CDFW, CDPH, and OEHHA](#) regarding a potential option for fishing under an advisory during seasons with high domoic acid.
- CDPH, OEHHA, and CDFW provided an update on HABs and explained that the state agencies were interested in working with the industry to develop a process for possible future HAB events.
  - As an update, last week an advisory was issued for rock crab in the Pillar Point area. Four of the six crabs tested had levels of domoic acid above the 30ppm safety threshold. This is not unusual for the area for this time of year. Samples are being solicited from the Monterey/Pigeon Point area.
  - The [frequently asked questions \(FAQ\)](#) document developed by Ocean Science Trust and was informed by the state agencies is a great resource to California and for the West Coast.
  - The agencies' [memo](#) was discussed. It was explained that if the viscera of California Dungeness (and rock) crab samples sporadically rise above 30ppm, the fishery could operate under an advisory as long as there were assurances that crabs caught in the advisory areas were parted out and eviscerated. The state agencies would need to work with industry to ensure contaminated product does not enter the market. To do this, reconciliation by record keeping will be vital and systems that are currently in place will need to be utilized and further developed. A large-scale issue similar to the one that was experienced during the 2015-2016 fishing season is not expected during the upcoming season, but there may be smaller areas with elevated levels. In these cases, an advisory could be placed in those areas with contaminated crabs, and crabs caught in that area would need to be well documented and eviscerated and could not be sold on the live market. The goal is for a safe product to be available in the market in a manner that retains its value, while allowing the fleet to continue fishing when there are smaller areas of high domoic acid conditions.
- The state agencies are interested in discussing this memo/potential option with the EC and call participants to inform options for the upcoming and future fishing seasons should HABs be a continuing issue. The agencies would like to enter this next season with a clearer strategy so that the fleet has a better idea of what the state may do if there are high levels of domoic acid this year.
- EC Members asked questions about the memo and options for fishing under domoic acid conditions:
  - How would CDFW's open areas as they clean up (e.g. by management area, by county, etc.)? Has CDFW determined how an opening outside traditional management lines would look (e.g. 30-day delay/fair start, checkerboard, by district)? Is a checkerboard approach to opening the fishery using the process outlined in the memo manageable from an enforcement perspective?
    - CDFW explained that according to the memo, closures would not be necessary unless domoic acid levels in the meat exceeded 20ppm. Statewide or large area closures are

considered by CDFW to be a blunt tool with little flexibility. The approach outlined in the memo leaves a lot of flexibility. For example, fishermen can decide to fish in the advisory area and sell to a processor who will follow the protocols outlined by the health agencies, or choose not to fish in an advisory area at all. If the fleet preferred a closure, CDFW would act on the advice of the health agencies.

- When will domoic acid sampling begin this year?
  - CDFW explained that initial domoic acid testing will begin in September, but testing will be exploratory, opportunistic, and dependent on cooperation from the fishermen to obtain samples. More systematic sampling will occur in October in conjunction with crab quality testing in both the southern and northern management areas. CDPH and CDFW will work in close coordination. It is not uncommon to see borderline levels in September samples with domoic acid levels dropping below threshold levels in late October.
- Members commended the state agencies for engaging in a conversation with the fleet and considering flexible, creative options for fishing in times when HABs are present.
- EC Members responded to the memo and potential option for fishing under an advisory. Concerns expressed include:
  - An advisory would negatively impact the markets since the media would only focus on the issue of domoic acid and contaminated crab. The markets never recovered during the 2015-16 season once the fishery opened due to the extensive media coverage highlighting the domoic acid issue.
  - An advisory and associated evisceration order would not be fair, enforceable, or workable. There are nearly 40 live buyers in California and five with processing capabilities. An evisceration order would cater to the five processors and lock out a large segment of the industry, including fishermen who don't sell to those markets.
  - Enforcement and tracking of the evisceration order would be incredibly challenging. The industry is hungry and fishermen can not be relied on to track the origin of the catch as many people will engage in profits regardless of the consequences. An advisory could only work if all crabs on the market were required to be eviscerated.
  - Self policing of the advisory areas is not realistic, particularly due to fishermen being impacted by last season's extensive season delay. Enforcement would need to closely track fishing in the advisory areas.
  - Extra capacity is needed to process samples in CDPH laboratories to reduce the backlog of samples.
- A potential solution identified by EC Members includes: A statewide opener with small area advisories. Do not allow fishermen to fish in the advisory areas while opening the larger areas where crabs test below the threshold levels.

### **Public Comment**

- Chris Voss, Commercial Fishermen of Santa Barbara (CFSB) and Commercial Lobster and Trap Fishermen's Association (CLTFA), shared an [alternative proposal](#) to the one outlined in the memo. The proposal outlines a process that would allow fishermen to sell Dungeness and rock crab and lobster under an advisory in which education programs would be used to show the public how to eviscerate lobster and crab. Lobster and rock crab markets are live and an evisceration order would negatively impact these fisheries. An advisory could be used as an opportunity to educate the public, until the 20ppm threshold is detected in the meat, at which time, the fishery should be closed. He expressed concern about how CDPH and the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) definition of an "adulterated"

product when the product has never resulted in illness from the public. The health risks of domoic acid in the viscera can be addressed with an advisory and rigorous interpretation of “adulterated.”

- CDPH explained that education of the public is an important tool, but it takes time implement broadly and inclusively. The agencies are looking to work with industry to produce outreach materials and support education. There will also be value in working with researchers and academia to understand how effective this kind of public education has been to evaluate if the public is adhering to the advisories.
  - David Helliwell, commercial fisherman and DCTF Member, reached out to Humboldt State University to inquire if they may be able to support processing of Dungeness crab samples, but they do not have the right equipment available. He asked if the health agencies declared that crabs were safe to fish under a health advisory, would CDFW open the entire coast?
    - CDFW confirmed that the fishery would be open under an advisory/evisceration order as outlined in the proposed option.
    - CDPH also confirmed and stated that under an advisory, the product would need to be processed in some way so that the adulterated portion of the animal was removed.
  - Stephen Melz, commercial fisherman, emailed the following comment: I applaud CDPH and CDFW for their attempts to provide fishermen with the opportunity to fish. Opening the entire zone under an evisceration rule would give fishermen a chance to go to work. The evisceration order should apply to all crab delivered until all areas test clean and the live and whole cooked market could kick in. This process would not be a perfect scenario but it would be a good plan B. I agree with Geoff and Bill that industry policing itself is not an option.
  - Gordon Fowler, commercial fishing permitholder, asked what, if any, tests were available to show the effects of public consumption of Dungeness crab once the fishery was opened. How many cases of illness were detected? Were crabs tested once the fishery opened?
    - CDPH explained stated that bivalve monitoring programs were used as a proxy to detect HABs and domoic acid in marine organisms once the fishery opened. The health agencies also looked at other indicators including sea lion behavior. Since no issues were detected after the Dungeness crab fishery opened, no new samples were taken of the crab. There were no illnesses reported from the consumption of crab. There is no test available to determine if someone has domoic acid poisoning, and there is a void in the human data unless a massive outbreak occurs.
  - The state agencies stated the feedback received during the call was helpful and expressed a desire to maintain open lines of communication with the fleet. The agencies will continue to refine the draft option for Dungeness crab, rock crab, and lobster. There may be an opportunity to come back to the industry with an updated option that may be more workable. The agencies will coordinate with Ocean Science Trust on the value of developing an updated frequently asked questions document.
4. *Discussion on the long-term structure and functioning of the DCTF including, but not limited to, the potential need to reevaluate the makeup of the organization, long-term funding, informing sunseting Dungeness crab regulations, management of the Dungeness crab trap tag account, etc.*
- Funding has been provided by OPC to administer the DCTF since 2009. Following submission of the January 2017 legislatively mandated report the OPC’s financial support will come to a close although the DCTF officially sunsets in 2019.
  - During the October 2015 DCTF Meeting, the DCTF agreed there is value in and a need for a body composed of the industry to inform the management of Dungeness crab, and included a recommendation to this effect in the [January 2016 legislative report](#). The DCTF requested the EC begin discussing this topic, with the goal of providing the DCTF with options for a long-term vision for their consideration during the October 2016 DCTF meeting.
  - The Admin Team asked the EC if there was still support for continuing some form of an industry representative body like the DCTF.
    - A few Members explained that during this challenging year, there was a great need for a DCTF or other industry representative body to help inform CDFW, CDPH, OEHHA, and the Legislature. The DCTF has supported discussions that would have not been possible within a port setting and has been effective in bringing the industry together.

- One Member said that although he supported an industry representative body in concept, he had concerns about the current makeup of the body and would like to see options for different representation. Another Member was unclear if the body should be set up like the DCTF or if it should be composed differently.
  - One EC Member expressed concern that the DCTF operates under a lot of restrictions due to the Bagley Keene Open meetings Act. Moving forward there should be a format that allows Members to be able to speak more freely between meetings so the body could be more efficient.
- One EC Member stated the DCTF has tackled a number of issues in the past and may not be worthwhile continuing moving forward. He expressed concern that many of the EC's recommendations to CDFW, CDPH, and OEHHA regarding the season opener last season fell on deaf ears and that smaller interest groups were more effective at lobbying the agencies than the EC. For example, contrary to the EC's guidance, the Director of CDFW opened the commercial fishery without a statewide opener and a public advisory was still put out by the health agencies when the fishery finally opened. Moving forward, these issues may be better addressed by fishermen's and port organizations and the processor's association. However, if a body were to continue, the processors would like representation on the body.
- An EC Member emailed his sentiments in advance of the call: "I think we need some type of industry-run body as this fishery moves into the future. The current DCTF has worked well but needs to be upgraded to reflect changes to fleet and fishery. We should be able to fund ourselves but having a non-industry facilitator had been important to our success. We have lots of challenges facing our industry in the future and we need a strong positive voice whatever it ends up looking to keep this fishery alive."
- Members discussed what the body should look like moving forward.
  - One EC Member suggested one meeting per year, six Executive Committee (or subcommittee) calls per year, elections every five years, a public website, and an Administrative Team similar to the current Admin Team. .
  - Another EC Member suggested that a chairman/vice chairman be identified to help support the Admin Team and steward the body's recommendations and interests in a way that would allow the Admin Team to continue to maintain their neutrality.
  - Various EC Members agreed the role of the body would be to advise on Dungeness crab fishery management, serve as the point organization for urgent issues that arise in the fishery (e.g. domoic acid, whale entanglements, etc.), serve as a conduit of information to the public, etc. Such a body would also have an important role if disaster relief is issued. The body should not be responsible for marketing.
- A suggestion was made to use a subcommittee (or the Executive Committee) to explore potential ideas for what the industry representative body should look like. The committee could explore the pros and cons for how the DCTF has functioned to-date.
- The Admin Team asked the EC to think about the foundation of the body. It could be a 501(c)(3)/non-profit organization or it could be set up through the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) as a council (e.g. the Salmon Council), a commission (e.g. California Sea Urchin Commission), or a marketing order. Establishing a body through CDFA would require legislation. There may be value in Dungeness crab fishermen reaching out to members of the sea urchin fishery to inquire how they feel the California Sea Urchin Commission is functioning.
- The Admin Team highlighted a recommendation in the [DCTF's January 2016 report](#) that requested OPC consider continuing to administer the DCTF beyond 2017. OPC's staff time to administer the DCTF would be funded by the industry.
  - OPC staff stated that the OPC supports the work of the DCTF and believes it is important for some version of the body to move forward. The body needs to find a way to be self-funded. OPC appreciates the request from the DCTF, however, OPC cannot legally fill the role the DCTF is requesting. The OPC can administer grants, but they cannot serve as a facilitator or administrator of the DCTF. The body should fund a facilitator/administrator directly rather than going through

OPC. OPC is still happy to help the DCTF moving forward and would be open to continuing to host the DCTF webpage.

- The idea of a questionnaire that could be posted online and DCTF Members could share with their ports to discuss options was discussed. The feedback from the survey could inform options for consideration at DCTF October meeting and provide DCTF Members with clarification moving forward.
  - The Admin Team asked the EC if a questionnaire would be useful and if there was any other information that would be helpful to provide the DCTF to inform the discussion. EC Members agreed that a questionnaire would be valuable to help learn about fleet-wide perspectives about the need for an organizational body..
  - **The Admin Team will develop a questionnaire/survey that can be posted online, circulated via email, and shared with constituents in DCTF Members' ports.**

#### Public Comment

- Zach Rotwein, commercial fisherman, emailed the following comment: I want to address the perception of blatant, self interest by certain members of the executive committee lobbying for an agenda to grab a portion of the crab resource for themselves. It is particularly disturbing as they are manipulating the legitimate concerns of whale entanglements and conservation groups concerned with this matter, to advance the idea that by closing the season early, whale entanglements will be avoided. By late winter the bulk of the crab gear is out of the water, usually 80%, on a normal season. It should be noted that those participants moving onto other fisheries do not wish to have a resource grab and I am only commenting on these particular members of the executive committee. It also should be noted that whales migrate the entire season, November-June. Whales in the later part of the season have far less obstacles to encounter. It is perceived, that the motivation behind these executive committee members, is to save those crab harvested in the later half of the season for when they are participating in the earlier part only. These later season crab would then be saved for themselves, in the beginning of the following season. This idea will also lead to the demise of their competition in short order. This demise also applies to those buyers that count on these later crab to sustain their business. To lobby in the name of conservation is disturbing to those that depend on the other half of the season. A partner of one of the executive committee members, testified this winter, before a California Senate committee, lobbying to close the later half of the season. To date I have yet to hear a fisheries biologist agree with their scheme. If the executive committee members are going to be allowed to use their platform for a blatant resource grab then I would recommend to any second half participant as well as anyone that does not want to legitimize a resource grab, to work to disband the DCTF and work by any means possible against this idea, as without the late winter, spring harvesting of crab we will soon be out of business.
  - An EC Member responded to the comment and explained processors would generally like to see the commercial fishing season shortened since many crabs caught in June and July are soft. There are also concerns about handling mortality of soft crabs and Dr. Steve Hackett from Humboldt State University has a study on this observation. He explained that processors are not trying to make a grab or prevent competition, rather prevent unnecessary mortality so those crabs are available the following season. The Member further highlighted that he could have a view as a DCTF member and express it without it being a view that is necessarily held by the full DCTF. The DCTF can discuss and vote on this as a group.
  - The Admin Team explained that DCTF Members have asked to add a discussion about shortening the season to the October 2016 meeting agenda. They requested individuals share any information that may help to inform conversation so that it may inform the conversation in October.
- Stephen Melz, commercial fisherman, emailed the following comment: Processors have the right to not buy at that time of year, the season has traditionally worked within in this time frame and flourished. For the greater good of the fishery, every legal male should be caught within that season to lessen the competition for food within the biomass so that smaller males and females can grow.

#### 5. *General public comment*



- Lori French, commercial Dungeness crab family, is looking for industry support for a booth at the Boston Seafood show. In addition to paying for a booth, she is developing background materials and display items. Costs to participate in the show are approximately \$10,000. She placed a \$2,000 deposit for the show and must pay the remainder in December. Anyone who is interested in supporting a California Dungeness crab booth at the 2017 Boston Seafood Show, including providing donations, should contact Lori at 805-748-2460 or [mbcrabber@gmail.com](mailto:mbcrabber@gmail.com).
- Karma Norman, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, is conducting a research project with her colleague Dan Holland to better understand the relationship between fisheries on the West Coast. The goal of the study will be to better model the way people flow between or within fisheries based on variability in the ocean, etc and understand how people respond to ecological/oceanographic issues. The study will involve a survey of West Coast fishermen, including Dungeness crab, to look at the reasons individuals choose to fish, benefits (including non-monetary benefits), etc. She is hopeful to begin surveying in the Fall and want to ensure the DCTF and other members of the industry are aware of the study so they can participate in it. Once the data is collected and analyzed, the project coordinators will convene a workshop to share the modeled results with those interested. Anyone who is interested in learning more or participating in the study should contact Karma Norma ([karma.norman@noaa.gov](mailto:karma.norman@noaa.gov)) or Dan Holland ([Dan.Holland@noaa.gov](mailto:Dan.Holland@noaa.gov) or (206) 302-1752).

6. *Adjourn*

- An EC Member highlighted a series of whale disentanglement trainings that are scheduled at the end of August. More information is available at <http://www.cawhalerescue.org/rsvp>.
  - **The Admin Team will circulate an announcement regarding NOAA's whale disentanglement trainings via the DCTF email list on August 26, 2016.**
- The Admin Team summarized the next steps that emerged from the call discussions.
  - **The Admin Team will produce a summary of this conference call and post it on the [DCTF webpage](#) once it has been reviewed for accuracy by the EC.**
  - **The Admin Team will share any questions/comments received about the [memo from CDFW, CDPH, and OEHHA](#) with the agencies.**
  - **The Admin Team will develop a survey/questionnaire that will be reviewed by the EC before it is finalized and circulated broadly.**
  - **The rock crab and lobster proposal referenced by Chris Voss will be made available via this meeting summary.**
- The next DCTF meeting will October 25-26, 2016 in Ukiah, CA.