



## New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116

John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Groundfish Advisory Panel

Hilton Garden Inn Logan Airport, Boston, MA  
May 8, 2018

The Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) met on May 8, 2018 in Boston, MA to discuss and make recommendations on: 1) progress on Amendment 23/Groundfish Monitoring; 2) progress on other priorities for 2018; and 3) other business, as necessary.

**MEETING ATTENDANCE:** Ben Martens (Chairman), Jackie Odell (Vice Chair), Bonnie Brady, David Goethel, Paul Parker, Maggie Raymond, Geoffrey Smith, and Hank Soule; Dr. Jamie Cournane and Robin Frede (NEFMC staff). In addition, approximately 10 members of the public attended, including Chad Demarest, Melissa Errend (NEFSC), Jim St. Cyr, Sarah Heil, Mark Grant, Emily Keiley (GARFO), Melanie Griffin and Libby Etrie (Groundfish Committee/Council members).

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:** Discussions were aided by the following documents and presentations: (1) Meeting memorandum and agenda dated April 30, 2018; (2) Presentations: Council and NMFS staff; (3) Draft alternatives for Amendment 23/Groundfish Monitoring; (4) Groundfish PDT memo to the Groundfish Committee regarding development of draft alternatives for Amendment 23/Groundfish Monitoring; (5) Summary of analyses conducted to determine at-sea monitoring requirements for multispecies sectors, FY2018, GARFO; (6) Dockside monitoring white paper, Groundfish PDT, version 2; (7) Groundfish PDT memo to the Groundfish Committee regarding analyses for Amendment 23/Groundfish Monitoring; (8a) Groundfish Committee meeting summary, Jan. 25, 2018; and (9) Correspondence.

The meeting began at 9:42 a.m.

### Other Business:

Two items were listed for other business: a request for an update on the reports from the April Council meeting related to discarding of legal-sized cod, and a question about an upcoming Observer Committee meeting.

### **KEY OUTCOMES:**

- The GAP requests the Groundfish Committee (Committee) to recommend that the Council delay selection of final range of alternatives for Amendment 23 until no sooner than the September Council meeting to allow for the alternatives to be aligned with completed Plan Development

Team (PDT) analyses and final reports with recommendations offered by the Fishery Data for Stock Assessment Working Group.

- The GAP does not support approaches that would reduce quota essential to the viability of the groundfish sector management program, as it relates to Section 4.1.1.3 (Additional Options for Industry Funded Cost of Monitoring).
- The GAP is concerned that discussions and analysis surrounding improving accuracy of catch have not clearly identified the benefits (e.g. degree to which improvements to stock abundance estimates will occur) and the costs associated of doing so.
- The GAP requests the PDT under their analysis of quantifying accuracy through observer bias, to review behavior of fishing vessels in certain years (2010-2012) when monitoring and annual catch limits were higher in comparison to recent years.
- The GAP recommends to the Committee that they request the PDT provide a stock specific analysis of the scale of missing catch (in pounds and percentages) necessary to account for the retrospective pattern on a stock by stock basis.

#### ***AGENDA ITEM #1: AMENDMENT 23***

##### ***PRESENTATION: PDT REPORT ON A23, MS. FREDE AND DR. COURNANE***

Staff provided an overview of the PDT's report on Amendment 23 (A23), including an update on the timeline for A23 development, an overview of the draft alternatives, and a summary of a PDT memo from April 6, 2018 which included several questions for the GAP to consider regarding A23 development. Staff also provided an update on the work of the Fishery Data for Stock Assessment Working Group, as this group is related to A23 and monitoring. The goals of the GAP's discussion were to provide guidance on development of the draft alternatives and possibly make recommendations to the Groundfish Committee on the draft alternatives and the PDT questions in the memo.

##### ***Questions and Comments on the Presentation:***

One advisor asked with regards to the alternative on streamlining sector reporting requirements how much of a demand there is for this and whether this interest is mainly from sector managers and/or NMFS. He wondered whether this could be moved to a framework instead. The advisor also offered a correction on the draft text for this alternative, clarifying that not all sector managers use NMFS reconciled data to fill out weekly sector reports, and that some sectors (such as his own) require that sector managers report using the sector data, as they have found this to be more reliable and faster than using NMFS reconciled data. He also expressed concern about using NMFS reconciled data to determine when vessels have reached an ACL for these same reasons. Another advisor, referring to the table in the presentation on coverage levels, asked if there is an explanation for the differences between target and realized coverage levels. Staff explained that in recent years this was attributed to an issue of underperformance of one of the observer providers, but that the Observer Program anticipates that this issue has been resolved, and can reach out to the Observer Program for a more thorough explanation. Additionally, staff explained this is also due to how target NEFOP coverage is projected by sea days, which can be difficult to project exactly as the sea day schedule often ends up changing throughout the fishing year. Another advisor said he would like information on coverage levels for the common pool in addition to sectors, as the common pool contributes to a fair amount of the discards in the fishery and he feels this should address both sectors and the common pool. The advisor also said that the legal questions on quota auctions should be addressed soon so they know if it is viable or not. Staff responded that they will check with NMFS on this for next the PDT meeting.

One advisor asked to clarify the timeline for A23 and whether the goal for today's meeting is to go through Section 4.1 Fishery Program Administration of the draft alternatives and make recommendations, and then go through Section 4.2 Groundfish Monitoring Program Revisions at the next meeting before the June Council meeting, as she was concerned about the ambitious timeline. Staff said that there would be an opportunity today to review the timeline and decide if they need to push it back after seeing what they get out of today. The advisor also said that with the Fishery Data working group running parallel to the development of A23 alternatives that they want to make sure anything that comes out of the working group that could be a recommendation for monitoring improvements would align with the timeline for A23. Staff explained that working group will provide a preliminary report for June and will be looking for feedback from the Council on how they can best address their objectives, and also may present initial recommendations if available, but do recognize the importance of aligning these processes.

***PRESENTATION: PDT REPORT ON A23 ANALYSES – OVERVIEW OF MONITORING PROGRAMS IN OTHER REGIONS, MS. ERREND***

Ms. Errend (NEFSC and Groundfish PDT member) presented research she is working on to provide an overview of monitoring programs in other regions.

***Questions and Comments on the Presentation:***

Advisors offered recommendations for additional information to consider in the summary of different monitoring programs, including

- Funding, such as whether the program is fully industry-funded, has cost-sharing, or is funded by the government;
- State of the fishery (i.e. New England groundfish is still in a disaster);
- How the data is used;
- Total revenue of the fishery and pounds landed;
- Estimated current monitoring program costs;
- For multispecies fisheries, the number of species in the FMP;
- Consideration of consolidation of the fleet;
- Current legal structure, including consideration of what happens if a fishery shuts down and what penalty structure exists, especially when describing monitoring programs in other countries;
- Information on Office of Law Enforcement and state agency boardings and dockside inspections; and
- Compliance rates.

Ms. Errend explained that she had planned to include much of this information in the summary but emphasized that some of this information can be challenging to obtain, especially from international programs. She also clarified that she did not include any information on boardings and dockside inspections as she felt that enforcement-related items should be considered separately. She said she plans to update the summary for the next PDT meeting.

One advisor recommended developing case studies from domestic U.S. fisheries early in the development of A23 to help in selection of alternatives. Ms. Errend explained she plans to include case studies as a part of her work and can begin with West Coast groundfish case studies. Another advisor asked where the New England groundfish fishery falls on the scale of partial at-sea monitoring coverage. Ms. Errend explained that the groundfish program falls in the middle of the partial coverage range and explained that there is a bimodal distribution of coverage levels across programs, with programs either having coverage

levels of roughly 1-20% or having full coverage. She also said that her first priorities in collecting information on different monitoring programs are to consider the goals and objectives of the monitoring programs and economic information.

***PRESENTATION: PDT REPORT ON A23 ANALYSES – UNCERTAINTIES IN THE CURRENT MONITORING PROGRAM, DR. COURNANE***

Staff provided an overview of the PDT's analysis for A23, which begins by describing the scope of the current monitoring program in the commercial groundfish fishery and any associated uncertainties. Staff explained that the purpose of these analyses is to identify the extent to which there is a need for change in any of the components of the current monitoring program, and to combine and synthesize work on the nature and effectiveness of current monitoring. Staff provided a summary of the analysis on four of the identified uncertainties: 1) Unreported and misreported catches (landings and discards) by species/stock; 2) Disagreement between data sources (vessel trip reports [VTR]/Dealer; VTRs/vessel monitoring system [VMS]); 3) The majority of analytical groundfish stock assessments contain a retrospective pattern, which may be caused in part by missing catch; and 4) Lack of an independent verification of landings may lead to catch reporting conspiracy/collusion between a dealer and a vessel, and has occurred. One uncertainty, 5) Fishermen behave differently when observers are on-board, is to be provided at the next meeting, while 6) Incentives exist in any quota-based system for misreporting/unreporting of catch (landings and discards), would be presented later during today's meeting.

***Questions and Comments on the Presentation:***

One advisor commented that as a sector manager he is used to seeing slight differences between dealer and vessel weights due to how a dealer estimates weight versus a captain and asked what expectation the PDT has for correlation between the two. Staff explained that so far, the PDT has mainly been thinking that if a potential change in the use of data were to be considered (for example, using vessel trip reports (VTRs) for weight instead of dealer reports), that it would be helpful to know the accuracy of VTRs, and emphasized that this is preliminary look at the data. Another advisor asked if the PDT had looked into alternate approaches to the Palmer paper for examining statistical area misreporting. Staff responded that the PDT is mostly summarizing what work has already been done. One advisor commented that the differences between VTR and dealers seemed minor and asked if the PDT thought this isn't a problem. Staff explained that the work summarizing differences should be considered preliminary, and while some issues such as statistical area reporting have been addressed to improve accuracy of reporting, this is not conclusive. The advisor had a question about the discontinuation of the previous dockside monitoring program and whether that could be reinstated by the Regional Administrator. Staff clarified that the dockside monitoring program was discontinued in Framework 48. Another advisor asked whether the PDT has looked at how many vertically integrated dealer/vessel businesses exist, as they think this would be helpful to know whether the Carlos case was an isolated incident or a continuing problem. Mr. Demarest (NEFSC and Groundfish PDT member) said he can look at the number of people with groundfish permits and dealer licenses, but said he also wants to emphasize that vertical integration is not a prerequisite for collusion. Another advisor said he would also like to see information on pounds of fish for these permit holders who also hold dealer licenses.

One advisor asked whether there has been analysis to examine what effect the Carlos misreported fish had on retrospective errors in assessments. Staff explained that there has been an estimate of this, and while they couldn't remember the exact number, it wasn't large enough to correct for retrospective errors. Mr. Demarest further explained that NOAA has never gone back and added in missing catch, and the question now is whether should be included given the magnitude of misreporting with Carlos. He said that Dr. Jon Hare and the Population Dynamics branch are aware of this and are working on a way to bring this

missing data back into assessments. Another advisor asked whether the number for Carlos misreported catch is the actual estimate or whether it is what he agreed to in legal proceedings, and pointed to this as support for not including it in the assessments.

One advisor said he thinks the with VTR and dealer estimates the slight differences makes sense given how people estimate roundfish versus flatfish, and that he was surprised by how well these estimates match up. The advisor also described analysis that has been done to explore the question of retrospective errors and missing catch using publicly available catch numbers that found that three times the amount of fish would be needed to make up for retrospective errors. He said that Carlos is not capable of accounting for all of the retrospective patterns and pointed out that there are a number of problems with the assessment models outside of missing catch, and recommended that the PDT explore these other potential causes of retrospective patterns. Another advisor noted work done by the Northeast Trawl Advisory Panel to explore the potential influence of gear efficiency of the survey gear on retrospective patterns which determined that the Bigelow trawl gear is not fishing on the bottom effectively. One advisor asked to get information on the number of vessels fishing in multiple statistical areas to figure out the scope and scale of the issue. Another advisor pointed out that the issue of statistical area misreporting was addressed within the past few years when there was a change in the requirement for when to report (haul back versus haul begin) which corrected for a lot of this, and said she thought it would be important to have information on what amount of fish is needed to make up for retrospective errors.

One advisor asked what the solution is for these identified problems in A23, as she is not sure how can anything can be done with retrospective errors in the assessments, thought that Carlos Rafael had been taken care of, and said the minor discrepancies in catch reporting seem to not be an issue. She clarified that she doesn't think that there aren't problems with fishery, but just wants to pursue the most important. Another advisor pointed out that everyone has a level of perception of what the scale of these problems is with behaviors like statistical area misreporting and the Carlos level of misreporting, and said it might be helpful for the GAP to have discussion and input on what the GAP thinks is the scope and scale of these problems and how best to address it in A23. Staff agreed that it would be helpful for the GAP to discuss and give input on these problems and how they can be addressed, but this would likely be for a later meeting. Another advisor said that the GAP should also be thinking about what can be done to support those in the fishery who do the right thing, and that is something heard a lot from industry.

#### ***PRESENTATION: PDT REPORT ON A23 ANALYSES – DISCARD INCENTIVES, MR. DEMAREST***

Mr. Demarest presented an overview of work he and Anna Henry (NEFSC) have done for the PDT A23 analyses to address the uncertainty: 6) Incentives exist in any quota-based system for misreporting/unreporting of catch (landings and discards).

#### ***Questions and Comments on the Presentation:***

Several advisors asked clarifying questions and offered suggestions for consideration within the model, including the ability to access leased quota, in addition to the costs to lease quota. One advisor asked for clarification on why there is not a value for DAS leasing included. Mr. Demarest explained that for DAS it was almost a sunk cost since the vessel was already going to fish, and so it couldn't be attributed to specific stocks. Another advisor asked whether highgrading would have the same incentive. Mr. Demarest said that it would and this can be shown because they have the value of stocks by market category.

One advisor asked what level of monitoring will make it feel like we do know what is going on with discarding, and said that we have a standard for setting the monitoring coverage level every year and asked why this doesn't work. Mr. Demarest explained that the current coverage level method is driven by

precision when it should address accuracy and bias and this is why it doesn't work, but that also the method doesn't work well for precision either. He said the PDT should be able to do work that shows that with the current monitoring system we have neither accurate nor precise data and can identify a new method to address this. He also explained that another component of this is that some fishermen hold themselves more accountable than others and this is something that should be addressed by A23. Another advisor said he thought this work could help address the disconnect between the assessments and catch and what fishermen see on the water.

***PRESENTATION: GARFO REPORT ON CATCH REPORTING COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT, MR. ST. CYR***

Mr. St. Cyr (GARFO) provided an overview of the process for quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) with respect to VTRs and dealer reports, in response to a letter from the Council requesting information on compliance with catch reporting. He also explained new auditing rules that are assisting in reconciling data between VTRs and dealer reports. The information presented was for fisheries within the entire Greater Atlantic region and not specifically for the commercial groundfish fishery, although, Mr. St. Cyr indicated trends in the information are similar.

***Questions and Comments on the Presentation:***

One advisor asked whether there are any differences in errors seen for paper VTRs versus eVTRs. Mr. St. Cyr said that the errors seen are similar because with either format it still comes down to a person filling out the form and they can be subject to error. He did say that a common error with eVTRs is selecting the incorrect drop down, which sometimes isn't detected until the eVTR is compared to the dealer report. Mr. St. Cyr also emphasized that they see a lot of errors initially with a new roll out of eVTR programs (e.g. recent party/charter eVTR requirement for the MAFMC fisheries) and that it takes a period of time for people to become familiar with the system and after that they see a decline in errors. The advisor also asked about eVTR and the ability to code in warnings for errors such as missing fields, whether there is anything that could be done to improve data quality. Mr. St. Cyr said there could be but cautioned that this shouldn't be done as a pre-fill option built into the app, but instead should be something the captain can set up as a pre-fill option. Another advisor asked whether VTR lag time is an issue. Mr. St. Cyr responded that it generally is not a problem. One advisor asked what the most common error is that impedes the ability to use a VTR and the scale of this error. Mr. St. Cyr said that he thinks it is due to a missing signature field, but that he would need to follow-up on this.

***PRESENTATION: PDT WHITE PAPER ON DOCKSIDE MONITORING, MS. FREDE***

Staff provided an overview of the PDT's dockside monitoring white paper, including the objectives of the white paper and a summary of the PDT's problem statement on dockside monitoring.

***Questions and Comments on the Presentation:***

One advisor asked why inspecting the fish hold is a necessary component of dockside inspections and whether instead the captain could sign an affidavit verifying that the information on the VTR is correct. Staff explained that in PDT communications with NOAA Office of Law Enforcement (OLE), OLE stated that fish hold inspections are a necessary part of dockside inspections, and also said that one idea the PDT has is for the use of handheld cameras rather than a human observer to inspect the fish hold. Another advisor asked what the penalty structure is for falsifying written documents. Staff responded that they would need to follow-up with OLE on this. One advisor also pointed out that part of the penalty structure

can be with the sector manager who can impose their own penalty. Additionally, he noted that there have been cases with catch hidden in secret compartments where a dockside monitor wouldn't be able to see. Another advisor said that determining accurate landings is an enforcement problem and not monitoring, and that they will need to have solutions that work and are cost effective.

**Motion #1: Goethel/Odell**

That the Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends that the Groundfish Committee have the Plan Development Team (PDT) create an option that does the following:

- 1) Requires all vessels, both common pool and sector, to register using the PTNS system to achieve the NEFOP level of coverage.
- 2) Return groundfish fishermen to the status of other Americas in our legal system of innocent until proven guilty by doing the following:
  - a. Suspend ASM and dockside monitoring for all vessels with no fishing violations or unresolved NOVAs
  - b. Instruct the PDT to work with NOAA enforcement and the Council's Enforcement Committee to create a penalty schedule of ASM and dockside monitoring percentages to be paid for by the vessels and dealer violators based on the severity of the infraction. The schedule will have a maximum penalty of 100% vessel and dealer funded monitoring, including dealer outbound shipments, for egregious violations.

*Rationale:* Achieves biological objectives and coverage necessary for assumed discard calculations. Promotes compliance by giving vessels and dealers incentive to comply with regulations. Puts the financial penalties where they belong on violators, not on ordinary fishermen and dealers. Does not waste fishermen or taxpayer dollars on expensive programs that have produced no discernable biological or enforcement benefit.

*Discussion on the Motion:* One advisor said that while he agrees with the first few points, he does not agree with the idea of suspending ASM coverage for those who have no violations because this won't work with achieving coverage levels for the Science Center, and said he also wasn't sure about a penalty schedule. The maker of the motion explained that his intent is for the burden to be put on those who are guilty – as an example, 100% observer coverage for Carlos. Another advisor said he reads this as saying that the monitoring system should try to catch people and that he completely disagrees with this because that is a task that belongs to a different branch of law enforcement, while the point of a monitoring system is to estimate the amount of fish being discarded. He said that he thinks that people like Carlos are a small amount of the problem, while the vast majority, maybe 80%, of people in the fishery are discarding fish because they don't have enough quota on a given stock, and that the Council should focus on how to fix this issue. He said that the point of an improved monitoring system for the fishery should be to get better estimates, and that if people do not see this as a problem it will be difficult to convince people to invest in better monitoring. The maker of the motion acknowledged this as a fundamental difference of opinion but said that he thinks that someone who discards cod because they don't have quota left is just as much a criminal as Carlos, and that 100% observers is not the answer to solving this, as part of the problem is that with the current observer system observers are reluctant to report discarding since they know that may prevent them from getting a trip.

*Motion #1 failed (2/4/1).*

## **Motion #2: Smith/Odell**

As it relates to the proposed Amendment 23 timeline as presented, the Groundfish Advisory Panel requests the Committee to recommend that the Council delay selection of final range of alternatives until no sooner than the September Council meeting. This would allow for the alternatives to be aligned with completed Plan Development Team analyses and final reports with recommendations offered by the Fishery Data for Stock Assessment Working Group.

*Motion #2 **carried** on a show of hands (7/0/0).*

## **Motion #3: Odell/Raymond**

As it relates to Section 4.1.1.3. (Additional Options for Industry Funded Cost of Monitoring) - while the fishery continues to operate under historically low annual catch limits, the Groundfish Advisory Panel does not support approaches that would reduce quota essential to the viability of the groundfish sector management program.

*Discussion on the Motion:* One advisor suggested rephrasing this to make it an affirmative – that the GAP would be interested in a quota auction if there is an ability to get additional fish. The seconder of the motion said she doesn't see how they will be able to get any more fish since the uncertainty buffer is already tapped. Another advisor was concerned that the motion is saying that they fishery should not have quota further reduced, but there could be other things to make that necessary, and so this should focus on not taking away quota for funding monitoring.

*Motion #3 **carried** on a show of hands (5/1/1).*

## **Motion #4: Odell/Goethel**

The Groundfish Advisory Panel is concerned that discussions and analysis surrounding improving accuracy of catch have not clearly identified the benefits (e.g. degree to which improvements to stock abundance estimates will occur) and the costs associated of doing so.

*Discussion on the Motion:* The maker of the motion explained that she understands that this analysis will be a part of the analysis of the alternatives but is concerned that this hasn't been at the forefront of discussion. One advisor said he would vote this down as he feels that the industry is stuck because they constantly have to address the issue of cost which makes change difficult and said they should be willing to invest today to get something for tomorrow. Another advisor said she supports this and that she understands the need for an investment of cost but that so far the industry has not seen any realized benefits. Another advisor noted that there seems to have been a change from a focus on precision to accuracy, and with precision being much easier mathematically to determine, he is not sure we can ever achieve accuracy in the fishery and that the cost for monitoring for accuracy could be cost-prohibitive. Mr. Demarest noted that there is funding in the social sciences branch of the Center to investigate cost-benefits of various monitoring technologies and said a report would be forthcoming.

*Motion #4 **carried** on a show of hands (5/0/1).*



**Motion #5: Odell/Goethel**

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that they request the Plan Development Team under their analysis of quantifying accuracy through observer bias, review behavior of fishing vessels during fishing years 2010 to 2012 when monitoring and annual catch limits were higher in comparison to recent years.

*Rationale:* Accuracy of catch data is connected to the accuracy of biomass estimates. Significant underestimation of biomass may negatively impact accuracy. Connecting catch data to estimates of abundance may resolve issues of observer bias.

*Discussion on the Motion:* The maker of the motion clarified that the focus is on 2010-2012 because that is when quotas were higher and so there was less observer bias because quotas were more in line with what fishermen were seeing on the water. One advisor asked whether there was observer bias before sectors. Mr. Demarest explained that there was, that there were different incentives for bias but it still existed (e.g. trip limits and not wanting to discard, the Hawthorne effect, which explains how people behave differently when watched). He clarified there is no control period with no observer bias to compare to. Another advisor asked whether this will address the other kind of observer bias – issues with estimation methods not being very scientific. Mr. Demarest explained that observer data varies in quality and is very good for estimating discards and not for estimating kept catch, which is okay as discards are the focus, and explained that observer kept catch information is required for D:K ratios. One advisor asked to clarify whether the intention is to limit the analysis to this timeframe or just to pull this period out to emphasize. The maker of the motion clarified that the intent is to emphasize.

*Motion #5 **carried** on a show of hands (5/0/1).*

**Motion #6: Odell/Goethel**

The Groundfish Advisory Panel recommends to the Groundfish Committee that they request the Plan Development Team provide a stock specific analysis of the scale of missing catch (in pounds and percentages) necessary to account for the retrospective pattern on a stock by stock basis.

*Discussion on the Motion:* Staff explained that this is something that would be done by a stock assessment working group and is beyond the scope of the PDT, but said the PDT can provide information on the stocks listed (witch flounder, CC/GOM yellowtail flounder, GOM cod) as this as already been described.

*Motion #6 **carried** on a show of hands (5/0/1).*

**AGENDA ITEM #2: FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 58**

**PRESENTATION: FW58 INITIATION, DR. COURNANE**

Staff provided a brief overview of Framework Adjustment 58 (FW58), which will be initiated at the June Council meeting. Staff explained that the draft scope of FW58 will include: to set specifications for FY2019 for US/Canada stocks (Eastern Georges Bank (GB) cod, Eastern Georges Bank haddock, and Georges Bank yellowtail flounder); to revise/establish rebuilding plans for several stocks (ocean pout, GB

winter flounder, witch flounder, Gulf of Maine/GB windowpane flounder, and Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic yellowtail flounder); to address Status Determination Criteria issue when analytic assessments fail; to provide additional guidance on sector overages; and to revise other management measures, if necessary.

*No comments or motions*

***AGENDA ITEM #3: OTHER BUSINESS***

The Chair asked about updates on the reports from the April Council meeting of discarding of legal-sized cod. Mr. Grant said that at this time there is not any further information from NMFS, and staff also said that the PDT will be looking into observer data to examine these reports of discarding of legal-sized cod.

Ms. Etrie responded to an earlier question about public access to the upcoming Observer Committee meeting, clarifying that the meeting will be held via webinar and an option for the public to participate will be provided.

The Groundfish Advisory Panel meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.