

Groundfish Committee Meeting

Boston, MA
April 7, 2016

Meeting Motions

Groundfish Monitoring Program

Motion 1: Goethel/Etrie

Task the PDT to:

1. Provide an analysis on how much variance would occur under alternate CVs using examples. For example, on a catch of 3 million lbs of species “X” with a CV of 30 what is the variance in the discard rate. Changing the CV up and down provide the variance in lbs so that we can understand how changes in the CV will affect our management strategy.
2. Provide a comparison of the differences in discard rates by gear type when the discard rate is calculated with only NEFOP data using the most recent fishing year for which the entire data set is available and the discard rate using NEFOP and ASM.

Rationale: These analyses would be helpful for managers and the public when understanding the benefits and risks of changing the CV standard. Regarding Task #1, we would like stock specific examples of how changing the CV standard may impact catch monitoring for sectors. Illustrate with examples of how altering the CV standard (i.e., increasing or decreasing it) for discard precision could affect catch monitoring for sectors. Include in the examples the distribution in pounds of discards. We request this analysis to understand how changes in the CV standard will affect our management strategy. The intent of the motion is to see the actual numbers using different CV values and a couple of different species as examples (as simple as possible with species and numbers, no graphs or complicated permutations necessary). Regarding Task #2, provide a comparison of the differences in stock-level discard estimates and CVs when the estimates are calculated with NEFOP data only versus using NEFOP and ASM. Also, include a comparison of these differences by gear type and mesh size (where available). Use data from the most recent fishing year for which the entire data set is available.

Motion 1 carried (10/0/0).

Motion 2: T. Alexander/McKenzie

Task the PDT to develop an analysis of a 100% requirement for a dockside monitoring for sector and common pool trips while unloading groundfish anywhere groundfish are unloaded. Including the possibility that the cost of this program would be the responsibility of the buyer.

Rationale: This analysis should examine sector and common pool trips. Lessons learned from the DSM program in 2010 could be used in the analysis of how to improve upon the previous DSM model. It was suggested that DSM in California and Canadian fisheries be examined. The analysis should consider the impact on small vessels and remote ports, as these may be at a disadvantage. DSM would reduce the incentive for a black market for fish (fish offered at reduced rate), and therefore should increase prices for vessel and dealers.

Motion 2a to substitute **Motion 2:** Griffin/Pappalardo

Move to substitute that the Committee task staff and/or PDT, as appropriate, to develop a draft white paper and report to the Council at the June meeting on monitoring strategies (ASM, shoreside, electronic, etc.) that would primarily contribute to accuracy and secondarily precision of groundfish catch reporting. The white paper should include a review of existing shoreside monitoring programs as well as past Council decisions on dockside monitoring with respect to achieving accuracy and precision in reporting of groundfish bycatch and landings as well as funding sources for the programs.

Rationale: We should take a step back and examine how to improve the monitoring system as a whole, rather than only focusing on refining a DSM program from the past.

Motion 2a to substitute Motion 2 carried (10/0/0).

Motion 2a as the main motion

Move that the Committee task staff and/or PDT, as appropriate, to develop a draft white paper and report to the Council at the June meeting on monitoring strategies (ASM, shoreside, electronic, etc.) that would primarily contribute to accuracy and secondarily precision of groundfish catch reporting. The white paper should include a review of existing shoreside monitoring programs as well as past Council decisions on dockside monitoring with respect to achieving accuracy and precision in reporting of groundfish bycatch and landings as well as funding sources for the programs.

Motion 2a as the main motion carried (10/0/0).

Motion 3: Griffin/Goethel

Move to request that the Council ask NMFS to provide information on the level of compliance with groundfish catch reporting (harvester and dealer) to date, initial feedback by the June Council meeting with full feedback at a later Council meeting.

Rationale: We request baseline information on compliance relative to harvester and dealer reporting. Successful groundfish catch reporting is not just dependent on suitable monitoring, but on the performance of the current harvester/dealer verification system (e.g., suitable reconciliation between VTRs and SAFIS reports achieved) as well as adequate enforcement of and compliance with reporting requirements. It is important for the Council to have information on each piece of the overall process to best inform where and how accuracy and precision in groundfish catch reporting can be achieved. The Council and NMFS need to have an initial conversation on what information can be provided to then be developed in further detail to best inform the overall discussion.

Motion 3 carried (9/0/1).

Windowpane Flounder Management

Motion 4: Goethel/Etrie

To task the PDT with evaluating the performance of the existing windowpane flounder accountability measures on the stocks and the fisheries impacted.

Rationale: This purpose is to examine the performance of the AMs relative to the impacts on the stocks, the groundfish fishery, and other fisheries. More specifically, the request is to focus the analysis on the social and economic impacts of the windowpane flounder GRAs.

Motion 4 failed (1/5/3).

Motion 5: Etrie/T. Alexander

To task the PDT with developing approaches to allocating northern windowpane flounder to sectors using other allocated groundfish stocks as proxies.

Rationale: The focus should be on northern windowpane flounder because of the recent impacts of the groundfish fishery. Accountability should be at the sector level. Because the stock is a discard stock, other targeted stocks (e.g., winter flounder) could be used as proxies when determining the allocation.

Motion 5 carried (8/0/1).

Motion 6: Etrie/Pappalardo

To task the PDT with developing approaches to establish sub-ACLs for northern windowpane flounder for other fisheries such as scallops.

Rationale: The focus should be on northern windowpane flounder because of the recent economic and social impacts of the northern windowpane flounder GRAs on the groundfish fishery. The scallop fishery is the only other major component of the catch of the stock. The scallop fishery does not have a sub-ACL and associated AM for northern windowpane flounder. Approaches moved to “considered but rejected” in FW 53 could be used as a starting point to develop the sub-ACL. The approach outlined in FW 53 was based on the scallop sub-ACL for southern windowpane flounder. In addition, how scallop sub-ACLs were developed for SNE/MA and GB yellowtail could be examined.

Motion 6 carried (8/0/1).