

New England Fishery Management Council
Joint Meeting of the Groundfish Committee and Groundfish Advisory Panel

Boston, MA

August 6, 2019

Meeting Motions and Consensus Statements

Management Uncertainty Buffer

Groundfish Advisory Panel Motion 1: Odell/Goethel

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee, for analysis purposes, that an uncertainty buffer be applied at the individual sector level and not to exceed 5 times the buffer for GB cod, GOM cod, GB yellowtail flounder, CC/GOM yellowtail flounder, and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder.

Rationale: The advisors were responding to the Plan Development Team (PDT) draft analysis¹ for the uncertainty buffer option as supported by the Council at their June meeting. The groundfish stocks listed were selected based upon analysis cited by the PDT, but it was noted the stocks would likely need to be reviewed periodically due to updated assessment information. The intent behind this concept is to craft an alternative that works to minimize monitoring costs for the industry.

Groundfish Advisory Panel Motion 1 *carried*. 7/0/0

~~~~~  
**Groundfish Committee Motion 1: Alexander/Etrie**

The Groundfish Committee tasks the Groundfish Plan Development Team, for inclusion in the alternatives, that an uncertainty buffer be applied at the individual sector level and not to exceed 5 times the buffer for GB cod, GOM cod, GB yellowtail flounder, CC/GOM yellowtail flounder, and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, and (1) to clarify the buffers evaluated should be 2 times, 3 times, and 5 times the current rate and (2) to consider if this approach should only be applied to fixed coverage rate options.

Groundfish Committee Motion 1 *failed*. 3/6/2

**Groundfish Committee Motion 2: Etrie/Alexander**

To clarify the management uncertainty buffers evaluated should be 2 times, 3 times, and 5 times the current rate (see Aug. 2, 2018 Groundfish PDT memo, Attachment #2<sup>1</sup>).

Groundfish Committee Motion 2 *failed*. 4/4/3

---

<sup>1</sup> See [https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/3b\\_190802-DRAFT-GF-PDT-memo-to-GF-Cte-re-A23-draft-alternatives\\_mgmt-uncertainty-buffers\\_v1\\_with-attachments.pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/3b_190802-DRAFT-GF-PDT-memo-to-GF-Cte-re-A23-draft-alternatives_mgmt-uncertainty-buffers_v1_with-attachments.pdf)

**Enforcement**

**Groundfish Advisory Panel Consensus Statement 1**

By consensus to recommend including the additions in the draft alternatives from the Enforcement Committee/Advisory Panel (statement 6 only: transiting rules/VMS declarations-for exemptions) as identified by Council staff in the presentation today.

~~~~~  
Groundfish Committee Consensus Statement 1

By consensus to recommend including the additions in the draft alternatives from the Enforcement Committee/Advisory Panel (statement 6 only: transiting rules/VMS declarations-for exemptions) as identified by Council staff in the presentation today².

FOR REFERENCE:

Enforcement Committee/AP Consensus #6: “An exemption from at-sea monitoring (ASM) and/or dockside monitoring (DSM) west of either line (west of 72 degrees 30 minutes west longitude, or west of 71 degrees 30 minutes west longitude) is enforceable, with VMS declaration and the application of transit rules east of the line.”

Council Staff Recommendation- Add to draft text VMS declaration and application of transit rules required

² See slide 22 at : https://s3.amazonaws.com/nefmc.org/2_190806_Council_staff_presentation_Groundfish-Committee-and-GAP.pdf