

NEW ENGLAND FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Groundfish Committee Meeting

June 4, 2015

Draft Motions

FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 55- SPECIFICATIONS**Consensus Statement #1**

The Groundfish Committee recommends that the Council requests that the Science Center meet with the fishing industry prior to the 2015 Groundfish Assessment updates (i.e., prior to the Assessment Oversight Panel meeting).

AT-SEA MONITORING**Motion #1 (Pierce/Pappalardo)**

The Groundfish Committee recommends that the Council requests an emergency action of NMFS to suspend the At-Sea Monitoring (ASM) program. During the suspension, the program will be evaluated for its effectiveness in support of stock assessments and its total costs to the groundfish fishery (e.g., returns to owner vs. ASM costs).

Rationale: Based on the information examined the costs to the groundfish fishery would be tremendous and further perpetuate the current groundfish fishery disaster - which is non-defensible. Evaluation of effectiveness of program is needed. We must be in a better position to have the data benefit the fishery and resource.

Motion #1A perfected (Pierce/Pappalardo)

The Groundfish Committee recommends that the Council requests an emergency action of NMFS to suspend the At-Sea Monitoring (ASM) program. During the suspension, the program will be evaluated for its effectiveness in support of stock assessments, its total costs to the groundfish fishery (e.g., returns to owner vs. ASM costs), and whether it is actually ensuring catch accountability.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (8/1/2).

Motion #2 (Etrie/Pappalardo)

To task the PDT to conduct a cost benefit analysis that includes identification of what data is collected under the ASM program and how that data is used both for sector ACE management and for stock assessment purposes and the corresponding cost. As it relates to assessments, the PDT should clearly identify on a case by case basis when ASM data has been used, what ASM data was used, how it was used (e.g., mortality, relative abundance, etc.), and what subset of trips compared to overall ASM trips observed generated the base data. Additionally, PDT analysis should clearly identify what additional data sets are collected that could be used to satisfy some of the data elements from ASM identified (e.g., Port Sampling – length frequency).

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (9/0/1).

**GROUNDFISH FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 54/MONKFISH FRAMEWORK
ADJUSTMENT 9**

Consensus Statement #2

The Groundfish Committee supports under the alternatives in Section 4.1.1 (“Allow vessels to declare a Northeast Multispecies Day-at-Sea at sea” Option 3 (4.1.1.3 “Allow only groundfish sector vessels holding limited access Monkfish Category C and D permits to declare a NE multispecies DAS at sea in the Northern Fishery Management Area”) as a better preferred alternative, as it would limit the alternative to sector vessels only.

Statement of Support #1

The Groundfish Committee strongly supported but could not come to consensus on removing the trip limit in the Northern area (Option 2 “Eliminate the Trip Limit on a NE multispecies DAS” in Section 4.2.1 “Northern Area Monkfish Trip Limit on a Groundfish DAS”)