

NEW ENGLAND FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Hotel Viking, Newport, RI
June 16-18, 2015
FINAL MOTIONS

Tuesday, June 16, 2015

REPORTS ON RECENT ACTIVITIES

1. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the Executive Committee:
to modify the 2015 priorities for the Groundfish Committee by adding at-sea monitoring issues and deleting the windowpane flounder white paper, recreational management measures process, coordination with ASMFC over estimating Groundfish bycatch in the lobster fishery, and preparations for the five-year review of the groundfish sector management program.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (10/6/1).

NATIONAL STANDARD 1, 3 AND 7 GUIDELINES

The Council agreed by consensus:
to approve the National Standards comment letter, as modified, for submission to the National Marine Fisheries Service.

OMNIBUS ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT AMENDMENT 2

2. Mr. Preble moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council select as a preferred alternative on Georges Bank a combination of Alternative 9 on the Northern edge with the increased habitat management area and Alternative 7 in the Georges Shoals area. For the Georges Shoal 2 area, select Option 2 (MBTG closure with hydraulic dredge exemption) with a sunset provision from Option 2 to Option 1 one year after implementation of the amendment, if an exemption area is not implemented.
The northeastern area is a “reduced impact habitat management area” generally closed to MBTG that (1) would allow rotational access for the scallop fishery, as approved in a subsequent scallop amendment or framework, and (2) would limit groundfish activity west of 67° 20’ W consistent with the eastern US/CA haddock SAP.
- 2a. Mr. Preble moved to substitute and Mr. Grout seconded:
that the Council select Alternative 1/No action as the preferred habitat management alternative on Georges Bank.
- 2b. Mr. Grout moved to table and Ms. Goethel
To table this motion until we bring back the motion from April.

The motion to table *failed* on a show of hands (3/13/1).

Substitute motion:
that the Council select Alternative 1/No action as the preferred habitat management alternative on Georges Bank.

Underlying motion:

that the Council select as a preferred alternative on Georges Bank a combination of Alternative 9 on the Northern edge with the increased habitat management area and Alternative 7 in the Georges Shoals area. For the Georges Shoal 2 area, select Option 2 (MBTG closure with hydraulic dredge exemption) with a sunset provision from Option 2 to Option 1 one year after implementation of the amendment, if an exemption area is not implemented.

The northeastern area is a “reduced impact habitat management area” generally closed to MBTG that (1) would allow rotational access for the scallop fishery, as approved in a subsequent scallop amendment or framework, and (2) would limit groundfish activity west of 67° 20’ W consistent with the eastern US/CA haddock SAP.

2c. Ms. Tooley moved to amend and Dr. John Quinn seconded:

That the Council task the scallop committee to consider “that the area north of 41 ° 30’ N, in Closed Area II be closed to the scallop fishery between June 15 - October 31” in the development of a rotational access area for GB north to address spawning female lobsters and potential gear conflicts.

The motion to amend *failed* on a show of hands (4/12/01).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

2d. Dr. Pierce moved to amend and Mr. Grout seconded:

that the Council select as a preferred alternative on Georges Bank a combination of alternative 9 on the northern edge with the increased habitat management area and alternative 7 in the Georges Shoals area. For the Georges Shoal 2 area, select option 2 (MBTG closure with hydraulic dredge exemption) with a sunset provision from option 2 to option 1 one year after implementation of the amendment, if an exemption area is not implemented.

The northeastern area is a “reduced impact habitat management area” generally closed to MBTG that (1) would allow rotational access for the scallop fishery, as approved in a subsequent scallop amendment or framework, and (2) would limit groundfish activity west of 67° 20’ w consistent with the Eastern US/CA haddock SAP. The area north of 41 ° 30’ N in Closed Area II be closed to the scallop fishery between June 15-October 31.

The motion to amend *carried* on a show of hands (13/3/01).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

Underlying motion:

That the Council select as a preferred alternative on Georges Bank a combination of alternative 9 on the northern edge with the increased habitat management area and alternative 7 in the Georges Shoals area. For the Georges Shoal 2 area, select Option 2 (MBTG closure with hydraulic dredge exemption) with a sunset provision from Option 2 to Option 1 one year after implementation of the amendment, if an exemption area is not implemented.

The northeastern area is a “reduced impact habitat management area” generally closed to MBTG that (1) would allow rotational access for the scallop fishery, as approved in a subsequent scallop amendment or framework, and (2) would limit groundfish activity west of 67° 20’ w consistent with the eastern us/ca haddock sap. The area 41 ° 30’ N in Closed Area II be closed to the scallop fishery between June 15-October 31.

The motion to amend **carried** on a show of hands (13/3/0/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

Substitute motion:

that the Council select Alternative 1/No Action as the preferred habitat management alternative on Georges Bank.

The motion to substitute **failed** (7/9/0/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

The main motion as amended:

that the Council select as a preferred alternative on Georges Bank a combination of Alternative 9 on the northern edge with the increased habitat management area and Alternative 7 in the Georges Shoals area. For the Georges Shoal 2 area, select Option 2 (MBTG closure with hydraulic dredge exemption) with a sunset provision from Option 2 to Option 1 one year after implementation of the amendment, if an exemption area is not implemented.

The northeastern area is a “reduced impact habitat management area” generally closed to MBTG that (1) would allow rotational access for the scallop fishery, as approved in a subsequent scallop amendment or framework, and (2) would limit groundfish activity west of 67° 20’ W consistent with the Eastern US/CA haddock SAP. The area 41 ° 30’ N in Closed Area II be closed to the scallop fishery between June 15-October 31.

The main motion as amended **carried** on a show of hands (7/6/2/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

3. Mr. Preble moved on behalf of the committee:
that in the Gulf of Maine, the Council select the Framework 53 spawning and cod protection measures as their final preferred alternative for spawning protection.
- 3a. Mr. John Bullard moved to amend and Mr. Preble seconded:
for Gulf of Maine spawning, that the Council select as preferred block 125 in April, as described in Alternative 2, closed to all commercial gears and fisheries, except exempted gear and exempted fisheries as well as vessels transiting the area with properly stowed gear.
- 3b. Ms. Goethel moved to further amend and Mr. Kendall seconded:
for Gulf of Maine spawning, that the Council select as preferred block 125 in April 15- April 30, as described in Alternative 2, closed to all commercial gears and fisheries, except exempted gear and exempted fisheries as well as vessels transiting the area with properly stowed gear.

The motion to amend **carried** on a show of hands (14/1/1/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

The motion to amend as amended:

that in the Gulf of Maine, the Council select the Framework 53 spawning and cod protection measures as their final preferred alternative for spawning protection. For Gulf of Maine spawning, that the Council select as preferred block 125 in April 15- April 30, as described in Alternative 2, closed to all commercial gears and fisheries, except exempted gear and exempted fisheries as well as vessels transiting the area with properly stowed gear.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (14/0/2/01).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

The main motion as amended:

that in the Gulf of Maine, the Council select the Framework 53 cod protection measures and the whaleback spawning closure as their final preferred alternative for spawning protection. For Gulf of Maine spawning, that the Council select as preferred block 125 in April 15- April 30, as described in Alternative 2, closed to all commercial gears and fisheries, except exempted gear and exempted fisheries as well as vessels transiting the area with properly stowed gear.

The main motion as amended **carried** on a show of hands (16/0/0/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

4. Mr. Preble moved on behalf of the committee:
That in the Gulf of Maine, the Council select Alternative 3, the Massachusetts Bay spawning protection area, as a final preferred alternative.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (14/0/2/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

5. Mr. Preble moved on behalf of the committee:
that on Georges Bank, the Council select Alternative 3 (Closed Area I North and Closed Area II, Feb 1- April 15) with Options B (commercial and recreational, with exemptions identified below) and Option C (exemption for scallop dredges), as their final preferred alternative for spawning.

The exemptions under Option B are as follows:

- Vessels that are transiting;
- Vessels fishing with exempted gears (spears, rakes, diving gear, cast nets, tongs, harpoons, weirs, dip nets, stop nets, pound nets, pots and traps, purse seines, surfclam/quahog dredge gear, pelagic hook and line, pelagic longlines, or single pelagic gillnets); and
- Vessels participating in the mid-water trawl exempted fishery.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (13/0/3/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

6. Mr. Terry Alexander moved and Ms. Etrie seconded:
to rescind the motion relating to the Council's selection of Great South Channel Alternative 4 as a Council preferred alternative on OHA2, adopted at the April Council meeting.

The motion ***failed*** on a show of hands (5/10/1/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

7. Mr. Preble moved and Ms. Goethel seconded:
to submit Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2, as amended, to NMFS GARFO.
Roll call vote:
Yes – M. Alexander, T. Alexander, V. Balzano, F. Blount, M Gibson, E. Goethel, D. Grout , E. Etrie,
P. Kendall, J. Pappalardo, D. Pierce, J. Quinn and M. Sissenwine
No –M. McKenzie and D. Preble
Abstention(s) – J. Bullard
Recusal(s) – M. Tooley

The motion ***carried*** on a roll call vote (13/2/1/1).

Recusal Statement: *Ms. Tooley - I am recusing as I am employed by a company that holds an interest in a company that processes greater than 10% of the total scallop lands as well as 10% of herring harvest which constitutes a possible conflict of interest under the guidelines.*

Wednesday, June 17, 2015

HERRING

AMENDMENT 8

1. Mr. Grout moved on behalf of the joint Herring/EBFM committee:
that the goals of Amendment 8 would be:
 (1.) To account for the role of Atlantic herring as a forage species within the ecosystem;
 (2.) To attempt to stabilize the fishery at a level designed to achieve OY;
 (3.) To address localized depletion in inshore waters.
- 1a. Ms. Tooley moved to amend and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
that the goals of Amendment 8 would be:
 (1.) To account for the role of Atlantic herring as a forage and predator species within the ecosystem;
 (2.) To stabilize the fishery at a level designed to achieve OY;
 (3.) To address localized depletion in inshore waters.

Motion to amend perfected to read:

that the goals of Amendment 8 would be:

- (1.) To account for the role of Atlantic Herring within the ecosystem including its role as forage;

- (2.) To stabilize the fishery at a level designed to achieve OY;
- (3.) To address localized depletion in inshore waters.

The motion to amend ***carried*** on a show of hands (14/2/1).

The main motion as amended ***carried*** on a show of hands (14/0/3).

- 2. Mr. Grout moved on behalf of the joint Herring/EBFM Committee:
to include as an objective in Amendment 8 – to develop and implement an ABC control rule that manages Atlantic Herring within an ecosystem context and addresses the goals of Amendment 8.

The motion ***carried*** on a show of hands (13/0/2).

- 3. Motion on behalf of the joint Herring/EBFM committee:
that an objective of Amendment 8 would be to establish spatial protection of sea herring to reduce pressure on subcomponents of the stock, shift effort intensity away from inshore, and avoid changes in meta-population structure, all in the interest of promoting abundant forage for important predators.

The motion failed on a show of hands (69/2).

- 4. Mr. Grout moved and Mr. Kendall seconded:
to support the SSC recommendation to conduct a peer review of the management strategy evaluation work developed by the herring PDT to determine whether it is a sufficient basis for management decisions in Amendment 8.

The motion ***carried*** on a show of hands (12/3/2).

- 5. Dr. Pierce moved and Mr. Pappalardo seconded:
another objective of Amendment 8 would be to modify the sea herring management area boundaries to better define inshore and offshore waters.

The motion ***failed*** on a show of hands (7/10).

HERRING – 2016-2018 SPECIFICATIONS

- 6. Mr. Grout moved on behalf of the committee:
that the herring OFL/ABC specifications for 2016 - 2018 be as follows:
 - 2016 – 138,000 mt OFL/111,000 mt ABC
 - 2017 – 117,000 mt OFL/111,000 mt ABC
 - 2018 – 111,000 mt OFL/111,000 mt ABC

The motion ***carried*** on a show of hands (13/3).

COUNCIL COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CCC)

- 7. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the Executive Committee:
that the Council supports the draft CCC NEPA white paper and the concepts it incorporates.

The motion ***carried*** on a show of hands (14/0/1).

Thursday, June 18, 2015

SEA SCALLOP SURVEY METHODOLOGIES REPORT

1. Ms. Tooley moved and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
that the Council support the finding from the Scallop Survey Peer Review that there is no compelling advantage in using both dredge and Habcam gears on the same vessel for the federal survey. A joint integrated federal survey using two vessels could result in a better survey with improved coverage. The Council requests the center consider conducting the federal dredge survey on commercial vessels.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (14/0/3).

AMENDMENT 19

2. Ms. Tooley moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council identify the goal of this amendment to be to develop an approach to enable scallop specifications be implemented for the start of the fishing year. The two main objectives for this action are:
 - 1) Prevent negative economic impacts on the fishery and biological consequences from late implementation
 - 2) Reduce administrative burden associated with late implementation.

The motion *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (17/0/0).

3. Ms. Tooley moved and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
that Amendment 19 should consider an alternative that would develop a separate specifications process for setting scallop allocations (different than current framework process) and an alternative to change the start of the fishing year from March 1 to April 1.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

FRAMEWORK 27

4. Ms. Tooley moved and Mr. Gibson seconded:
to initiate Framework 27, an action that will set fishery specifications for fishing year 2016 and default measures for FY 2017.

The motion *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (17/0/0).

RSA

5. Ms. Tooley moved and Mr. Mark Alexander seconded:
to approve RSA priorities for 2016 and 2017 as recommended by the Scallop Committee in document #3.

The motion *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (17/0/0).

6. Ms. Tooley moved and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
that the Council requests the scallop PDT investigate how to potentially improve information collected by observers on discard mortality and high-grading (e.g. modify at sea monitoring protocols to be more specific about reasons for discards).

The motion *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (16/0/0).

7. Ms. Tooley moved and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
that the Council forward the other research priorities identified by the Scallop Committee to the Research Steering and Groundfish committee that are not specific to the scallop RSA program. These items should be forwarded for future consideration in overall research priorities. Other research priorities include: 1) assess where juvenile cod hot spots are; 2) dedicated survey of windowpane flounder to improve assessment; 3) identify winter flounder spawning areas; and 4) use commercial vessels to collect basic oceanographic data (temp, salinity, ph, etc.) .

The motion *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (16/0/0).

MONKFISH

8. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council select the option to “allow all limited access monkfish category C and D vessels to declare a Northeast multispecies day at sea in the northern fishery management area” (Section 4.1.1.2 Option 2) as the preferred alternative .
- 8a. Ms. Goethel moved to amend and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
to reflect the changes that were made at the Groundfish Committee and adopted by the MAFMC (Option 3 sector vessels only) .

The motion to amend *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (17/0/0).

The main motion as amended *carried* unanimously on a show of hands (17/0/0).

9. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council select No Action (Section 4.1.2.1 Option 1) for “southern management area at-sea monkfish DAS declaration” as the preferred alternative.
- 9a. Ms. Etrie moved to amend and Ms. Tooley seconded:
that in Section 4.1.2 the Council select Option 2 “allow at-sea DAS declaration in the SFMA” as its preferred alternative.

The motion to amend *failed* on a show of hands (4/13/0).

The main motion:

That the Council select No Action (Section 4.1.2.1 Option 1) for “southern management area at-sea monkfish DAS declaration” as the preferred alternative.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (14/2/1).

10. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council select No Action (Section 4.1.3.1 Option 1) for “modify DAS/trip limit allocation for category F (offshore vessels)” as the preferred alternative.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

11. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council select No Action (Section 4.1.4.1 Option 1) for “DAS requirements for RSA vessels when on a monkfish DAS” as the preferred alternative .

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (14/1/2).

12. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council select No Action (Section 4.2.1.1 option 1) for “northern area monkfish trip limit on a groundfish DAS” as the preferred alternative.

- 12a. Dr. Pierce moved to substitute and Mr. John Bullard seconded:
to adopt the MAFMC motion to modify Section 4.2.1.2 Option 2 (eliminate the trip limit on a NE multispecies day at sea) to add that the vessel must use a monkfish DAS while on that trip.

The motion to substitute *carried* on a show of hands (14/2/0).

The main motion as substituted *carried* on a show of hands (15/1/1).

13. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
to allow the use of 5” minimum mesh standup gillnets on monkfish DAS in the Mid-Atlantic exemption area, and allow for the possession of monkfish and dogfish on the same trip and limiting the number of standup nets on board to no more than 50.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (11/3/3).

14. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
to allow vessels in the SNE dogfish and monkfish exemption area to be able to fish 6” inch minimum mesh stand up net while on a monkfish DAS during May to October using no more than 50 standup nets, and allow both monkfish and dogfish to be retained on the same trip at any time.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (12/2/3).

15. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
to allow vessels in the SFMA to be able to fish 6.5 inch minimum mesh stand up gillnet at anytime and anywhere while on a groundfish/monkfish DAS.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (14/0/3).

16. Dr. John Quinn moved on behalf of the committee:
that the Council formally adopt Framework 9 to the Monkfish FMP.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (14/2/1).

ELECTRONIC MONITORING WORKING GROUP (EMWG)

17. Mr. Kendall moved Mr. Balzano seconded:
that the Council recommends to NFMS GARFO that in the short-term electronic monitoring in the groundfish fishery be used for the purpose of verifying VTR reported discards of groundfish ACE managed species.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

GROUND FISH

FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 55- SPECIFICATIONS

18. Mr. Blount moved and Ms. Goethel seconded:

that the Council requests that the Northeast Fisheries Science Center meet with the fishing industry prior to the 2015 groundfish assessment updates (i.e., prior to the assessment oversight panel meeting).

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

19. Mr. Blount moved and Mr. Preble seconded:
that the Council initiate Framework Adjustment 55 - an action to set specifications for FY 2016 – FY 2018.
- 19a. Mr. Terry Alexander moved to amend and Ms. Etrie seconded:
and to request the Council review approval for a new sector for the Sustainable Harvest Sector to operate in FY 2016 in Framework Adjustment 55.

The motion to amend *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

The motion as amended:
that the Council initiate Framework Adjustment 55 - an action to set specifications for FY 2016 – FY 2018 and to request the Council review approval for a new sector for the sustainable harvest sector to operate in 2016 in Framework 55.

The main motion as amended *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

AT-SEA MONITORING

20. Mr. Blount moved on behalf of the committee:
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.
- 20a. Mr. Blount moved to split the motion and Mr. Preble seconded:
that the Council requests an Emergency Action of NFMS to suspend the at-sea monitoring (ASM) program.

the Council recommends that 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 to split *carried* on a show of hands (16/0/1).

First part of the split motion:
that the Council requests an emergency action of NMFS to suspend the at-sea monitoring (ASM) program.

The motion *carried* on a show of hands (9/7/1).

Second part of the split motion:
that the Council requests that NMFS evaluate the ASM program 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.

- 20b. Dr. McKenzie moved to amend and Mr. Mark Alexander seconded:
that the Council requests that NMFS evaluate the ASM program for its effectiveness in support of stock assessments, its total costs to the groundfish fishery (e.g., returns to owner vs. ASM costs), data precision and accuracy, and whether it is actually ensuring catch accountability.

The motion to amend **carried** on a show of hands (10/2/5).

The main motion as amended:

that the Council requests that NMFS evaluate the ASM program for its effectiveness in support of stock assessments, its total costs to the groundfish fishery (e.g., returns to owner vs. ASM costs), data precision and accuracy, and whether it is actually ensuring catch accountability.

The main motion as amended **carried** on a show of hands (13/2/2).

21. Ms. Etrie moved and Ms. Tooley seconded:
the Council requests that NMFS adjust the 2015 at sea monitoring program for multispecies sectors through administrative action. The intent of this request is to improve the efficiency of the program through application of logical administrative improvements that will reduce costs of the ASM program without compromising compliance with the Amendment 16 and Framework 48 CV standards / requirements. These modifications are requested for the current fishing year (FY 2015), which is based on existing analysis using FY 2013 data, as the Council continues development of the ASM framework.

Based upon Table 1 (realized stock CVS) on page 15 of the "summary of analyses conducted to determine at sea monitoring requirements for multispecies sectors FY 2015":

1. Recalculate the resulting CV for Southern New England yellowtail flounder (ranked highest) with coverage for the entire monitoring program being set at the Georges bank yellowtail flounder rate (ranked second highest).
2. Provide finer scale information on SNE yellowtail flounder strata contributing to the higher coverage requirement for that stock for the purpose of informing modifications to the program to meet the cv30 standard for that stock and specify the SNE yet coverages necessary to meet the CV standard in FY 2015.
3. Provide a report as early as possible to the sectors so that they can begin to plan cost sharing methods to achieve equitable distribution of costs to offset differential coverage on SNE yellowtail flounder.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (10/2/3).

22. Ms. Goethel moved and Mr. Grout seconded:
to task the groundfish PDT to investigate streamlining the ASM program for the purposes of improving efficiency to include the selection process, cost effectiveness and other issues and to develop alternatives for consideration in the ASM framework action as referenced in PDT memo, document #8, pg. 7-8.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (14/0/1).

23. Mr. Pappalardo moved and Mr. Terry Alexander seconded:
to request that NFMS consider differentiating the strata for extra-large mesh trips through administrative action.

The motion **carried** on a show of hands (14/0/1).

OTHER BUSINESS

Council agreed by consensus:

To have the Council chair send a letter to NOAA OLE and GARFO expressing concern about the impacts of losing Skymate as an approved VMS vendor on the small boat fleet in New England. These concerns include: whether there is currently an approved vendor with a VMS that draws low enough amps to not drain the batteries of small vessels without access to shore power or a generator as well as the cost and availability of sufficient approved vendors to install the new approved VMS for all former Skymate users before the Sept. 30. The letter should also include a request that all current Skymate users be granted a waiver from the Sept. 30 deadline for transitioning to a new VMS vendor and grant an exemption that would allow these vessels to power down after Sept. 30 until such time that an approved VMS that is practical for usage on these small vessels can be installed.