

**New England Fishery Management Council
Groundfish Committee Report
June Council Meeting - Hybrid
June 28-30, 2022**

Meeting Motions

Framework Adjustment 65 / Specifications and Management Measures

Motion 1:

To write a letter to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council informing them of our intention to consider a Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic (SNE/MA) winter flounder sub-ACL for the small mesh fisheries and inquire if they would like to take lead on establishing the AM for those small mesh fisheries under their purview.

Motion 2:

To include Georges Bank cod as a stock to pursue “additional measures to promote rebuilding” in FW65 specifically to consider mechanisms that could be adopted to minimize the impact of pound-for-pound payback applied to the commercial fishery if the recreational fishery exceeds its catch target.

Amendment 23 Metrics

Motion 3:

To include the following analyses in the Amendment 23 review metrics:

1. Comparison of target coverage rates vs. realized coverage rates, including comparison between vessels using EM monitoring tools and human at-sea monitors
2. The number of trips where waivers for monitoring requirements are issued and the reason for the waiver
3. Evidence of bias in catch reporting between monitored and un-monitored trips, including:
 - a. Trip duration
 - b. Species composition and size composition of landed groundfish
 - c. Species composition and weight of discarded groundfish
 - d. Ratio of landed to discarded fish by species
4. Overall industry and agency costs for meeting monitoring requirements, including a cost comparison between EM-monitored trips and human at-sea monitored trips
5. Efficacy of the Dockside Monitoring Program required in the Maximized Retention EM program, including purpose of the program (size composition and weights of sub-legal fish, validating dealer weights, hold inspection) cost of the program and the use of information collected

Motion 4:

To include in the current development of A23 metrics additional analysis that go to quantifying the magnitude of bias analyzed in A23. Specifically, pursue the numerous suggestions offered by the A23 SSC Sub-Panel Peer Review on ways the following two analysis could be further pursued to understand the magnitude of the observer bias question. (1) Methods to Predict Groundfish Catch in the presence of an observer (2) Methods to evaluate groundfish catch ratios A23 analysis

Motion 5:

Include the following under A23 metrics:

1. True cost of monitoring at significantly higher targets by sea day (not days absent)
 - a. including sea day rate, travel, training & meal reimbursement, equipment, operations costs etc.
 - b. should be for each of the 3 industry paid programs, ASM, Audit EM & MREM
2. State Area/BSA Reporting (Palmer work) - comparing VTR/OBS/VMS data
 - a. can help determine if getting better with higher levels of coverage
 - b. also can help to determine if differences are due to misreporting or due to differences in guidance
3. Compare/Contrast discard estimates by monitoring program (ASM, Audit EM, MREM, NEFOP)
4. Rerun PDT observer bias work since don't expect coming close to 100 % realized rate for trips with ASM requirements
 - a. can simplify this work by tailoring analysis to those that showed significant differences originally
5. Examine if those vessels that showed observer bias in the PDT work remaining in the fishery post 23
6. For trips that are exempt from ASM in SNE (west of 7130), could potentially look at observed discard estimates Pre/Post A23 since coverage rates will be dramatically different
7. recommendation of QA/QC on lease price data if examining leasing information