

New England Fishery Management Council

Groundfish Advisory Panel

South Portland, Maine

May 21, 2019

Meeting Motions

Dockside Monitoring for the Fishery

Motion 1: Soule/Smith

The Groundfish Advisory Panel, with respect to dockside monitoring, requests from the Groundfish Committee an explanation of the groundfish landings amongst each of the regional dealers and an estimate of costs of groundfish unloaded.

Motion 1 *carried* 7/0/0.

Motion 2: Goethel/Soule

The Groundfish Advisory Panel asks the Groundfish Committee the following: what is the problem that the dockside monitoring program is trying to address, and is it a cost-effective solution?

Motion 2 *carried* 7/0/0.

Motion 3: Goethel/Brady

The Groundfish Advisory Panel asks the Groundfish Committee, if added: what is the effect of the exemptions from the dockside monitoring program?

Motion 3 *carried* 4/1/2.

At-Sea Monitoring Coverage Options

Motion 4: Goethel/Soule

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee to add an alternative for coverage levels based on trips of the vessel (e.g., if the coverage level is 25% of trips taken by the vessel, then the vessel takes four trips, it would get covered once). These would be vessel-specific coverage rates.

Motion 4 *carried* 7/0/0.

Motion 5: Soule/Odell

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Committee to add an option to (a) set a standard (i.e., observer bias) to measure the effectiveness of at-sea monitoring at the sector level, and (b) if the sector is not meeting the set standard, then provide the ability in the monitoring plans to correct the problem

Motion 5 carried 6/1/0

Exemptions from Groundfish Monitoring

Motion 6: Raymond/Odell

Move that if the Council agrees to exempt vessels based on catch composition that the Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that those exemptions be reviewed annually.

Motion 6 carried 7/0/0.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Analysis

Motion 7: Odell/Goethel

The Groundfish Advisory Panel requests to the Groundfish Committee that the baseline NEPA analysis used to estimate socio-economic impacts of the Amendment 23 alternatives be based on 100% industry funding (e.g., fishing revenues).

Motion 7 carried 7/0/0.

Motion 8: Odell/Goethel

The Groundfish Advisory Panel requests the Groundfish Committee have the PDT analyses include a summary table (see attached for an example), broken out by gillnet and trawl fleet separately. This summary table should be available for the June Council meeting and public hearing document for Amendment 23.

USE SAME TIME PERIODS USED IN THE ANALYSIS (eg: annual or stanza) If Stanza's, filter by average annual Days Absent per vessel										
Annual Days Absent by individual vessels in category	Number of Vessels	Total Days Absent (group)	Average Days Absent per vessel	Proportion of fleet Kall	Proportion of fleet Landings	Porportion of fleet groundfish revenue	Variance Stanza 1	Variance Stanza 2	Variance Stanza 3	Variance Stanza 4
<20 DAS										
20-50 DAS										
50-80 DAS										
>80 DAS										
TOTALS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				

Motion 8 carried 7/0/0

Motion 9: Goethel/Smith:

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that the cost-benefit analysis include costs and benefits to both fishermen and fish.

Motion 9 carried 4/3/0.

Exemptions from Groundfish Monitoring

Motion 10: Martens/Goethel

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee, that under exemptions, to include an option that allows sectors to request, through their sector operation plans, exemptions from at-sea monitoring and/or dockside monitoring if groundfish landings and discards are not significant (e.g., non-directed groundfish trips).

Motion 10 carried 6/0/1.